



MKH
MEDKEYHABITATS



GUIDELINES FOR THE STANDARDIZATION of mapping and monitoring methods of marine magnoliophyta in the Mediterranean



NOTE: The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNEP/MAP-RAC/SPA concerning the legal status of any State, Territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of their frontiers or boundaries. The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of UNEP/MAP-RAC/SPA.

© 2015 **United Nations Environment Programme**
Mediterranean Action Plan
Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (RAC/SPA)
Boulevard du leader Yasser Arafat
B.P. 337 - 1080 Tunis Cedex - TUNISIA
E-mail: car-asp@rac-spa.org

Reproduction of this publication for educational or other non-commercial purposes is authorized without prior written permission from the copyright holder provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of this publication for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without prior written permission of the copyright holder.

For bibliographic purposes, this volume may be cited as:

UNEP/MAP-RAC/SPA, 2015. Guidelines for Standardization of Mapping and Monitoring Methods of Marine Magnoliophyta in the Mediterranean. Christine Pergent-Martini, Edits., RAC/SPA publ., Tunis: 48 p. + Annexes.

Graphic design: IGD Communication - www.i-graphicdesign.com

Cover photos credit: Gérard Pergent

This guidance has been edited within the framework of the MedKeyHabitats Project “Mapping of key marine habitats in the Mediterranean and promoting their conservation through the establishment of Specially Protected Area of Mediterranean Importance (SPAMIs)”

The MedKeyHabitats Project is implemented with the financial support of MAVA Foundation.



Available from:
www.rac-spa.org

**Guidelines for the Standardization
of Mapping and Monitoring Methods
of Marine Magnoliophyta in the Mediterranean**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of contents	03
Study Context	04
Approach adopted	04
1. Synthesis of the round table	04
2. Analysis of available data	05

Proposals for Guidelines for Mapping Magnoliophyta Seagrasses in the Mediterranean

1. Problem	06
2. Which approach to be taken?	09
a) What precision for what surface area to be mapped?	09
b) What available tools for mapping surveys?	09
c) What methods of analysis to interpret the data?	16
3. Case Studies	24
a) Distribution of <i>Posidonia oceanica</i> meadows along the coast of Corsica (Pasqualini, 1997)	24
b) Cartographie de la limite supérieure des herbiers de Tunisie (PNUE-PAM-CAR/ASP, 2009b)	24
c) Mapping of magnoliophyta meadows at the aquaculture installation in the Balearic Islands (Delgado <i>et al.</i> , 1999)	25
d) Mapping of magnoliophyta meadows in view of the organized berthing in Corsica (Salivas-Decaux <i>et al.</i> , 2008)	25

Proposals for Guidelines for monitoring magnoliophyta meadows in the Mediterranean

1. Problem	27
2. What steps to be taken?	27
a) Monitoring – why and how?	27
b) What monitoring system?	38
c) How to interpret monitoring data?	40
Bibliography	44

Annex 1

Keynote presentation at the Round table, organized by RAC/SPA in Hvar (September 2009)	I
--	---

Annex 2

Summary of the Round table, organized by RAC/SPA in Hvar (September 2009)	II
---	----

Annex 3

Grids of interpretation into five classes of few descriptors of <i>Posidonia oceanica</i> meadow	IV
--	----

Study Context

Any attempt at management means that a prior assessment has to be made to appraise the state of knowledge concerning the resources to be managed. Therefore marine magnoliophyta distribution maps are an absolute prerequisite to any conservation activity for these assemblages, but an enlightened decision is not to be limited to the sole information of knowing that it is present or absent (Mc Kenzie *et al.*, 2001) and thus additional data is required such as the typology of the seagrass, its abundance, its state of health and/or conservation and a suitable monitoring system being set up.

These elements are indeed amongst the priority activities to be undertaken within the framework of the Action Plan for the Conservation of Marine Vegetation in the Mediterranean, adopted in 1999 by the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention (UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA, 1999). During the implementation evaluation of this Action Plan in 2005 (UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA), it transpired that very few countries were able to set up this monitoring system, and even if some mapping programmes had been initiated in several sites, the areas which had really been mapped were very few in view of the potential surfaces occupied by the seagrasses in the Mediterranean (over 35 000 km² just for the *Posidonia oceanica* seagrass; Pasqualini *et al.*, 1998).

A round table on the mapping and monitoring methods was organized, to improve this situation, at the Third Mediterranean Symposium on Marine Vegetation in Marseilles in March 2007. The managers present expressed their need for "Practical Guides" so as to harmonize the methods and comparison of results which had been obtained on a regional level, so as to facilitate decision making for the management of coastal environments (UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA, 2007). Using the marine vegetation as an environment evaluation tool was also pointed out and a suggestion was made to propose specific protocols to create a "tool box" which could cater for their needs (UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA, 2007).

Thus at their 15th Ordinary Meeting in Almeria (January 2008), the Contracting Parties asked the Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (RAC/SPA) to improve the existing inventory tools and to propose a standardization of the mapping and monitoring techniques for these assemblages.

In September 2009, RAC/SPA organized within the framework of the Second Workshop on Mediterranean Marine Magnoliophyta in Hvar from 6 to 10 September 2009, a round table on the "standardization of mapping and monitoring methods of marine magnoliophyta in the Mediterranean region" so as to obtain the views of the scientists concerned and also to elaborate the guidelines.

Approach adopted

The approach adopted consisted of two parts: first the organization of a round table to assess the experiences in this domain in the Mediterranean and then an analysis of the international literature.

1. Synthesis of the round table

The round table took place at the 2nd workshop on Mediterranean marine magnoliophyta in Hvar, Croatia, from 6 to 10 September 2010. A brief presentation of the theme (Annex 1) made it possible to have a fruitful exchange between approx. sixty participants (Annex 2).

At the end of the discussions (Annex 2) it transpired that:

For mapping:

- ◆ There are numerous methods which have proved their worth and several specific programmes have already been devoted to this (e.g. the Interreg III B "POSIDONIA" Programme; MESH programme).
- ◆ These methods are well known and therefore standardization can be envisaged.
- ◆ All the methods are usable in the region but some of them are more suitable for a given species (e.g. large-sized species) or particular assemblages (dense seagrasses).
- ◆ The available methods can be used in most of the Mediterranean countries even though there are implementation problems due to the absence of training, competence and/or specific financing. Efforts must therefore be in an order of priority (e.g. sites to be studied as a priority) and equilibrium is to be ensured between the mapping objectives and the method(s) implemented. There is however a wide consensus to propose common tools which are applicable everywhere and by everyone.

Monitoring:

- ◆ Today there are several monitoring systems for marine magnoliophyta backed up by several years of experience and which have been successfully implemented worldwide and in the Mediterranean (e.g. SeagrassNet, MedPosidonia programme, Posidonia national monitoring networks).
- ◆ Even though the monitoring methods are similar (regular follow-up in the course of time with very often the establishment of fixed markers), the monitoring objectives and the descriptors taken into account during these operations are quite diverse. These descriptors are to provide information on the state of the seagrass, the plant or the interactions between the latter and its environment.
- ◆ Some descriptors are used by all the Mediterranean scientific community (e.g. seagrass density) but the measuring techniques are often very different, so that, even though a precise standardization is technically feasible, it seems to be difficult to promote.
- ◆ The Mediterranean monitoring systems are highly specific insofar as they are mainly dedicated to *Posidonia oceanica*. In contrast, the SeagrassNet has the advantage of being able to be used for almost all the magnoliophyta species but is less relevant for some genera (e.g. *Posidonia*) or some sectors (deep bathymetric tranche).
- ◆ The experience with the MedPosidonia programme shows that the different monitoring methods implemented seem to be applicable to all the Mediterranean countries insofar as those persons responsible for the monitoring receive appropriate training in this domain.

Even though there is no clear consensus as in the case of the mapping methods, it seems desirable, in view of the strong demand expressed by the managers, to try and come up with some common and standardized tools. These tools should be selected from the existing monitoring systems and could be classified according to their relevance depending on the monitoring objectives and their ease of implementation.

2. Analysis of available data

In the light of the round table discussion results, an additional bibliographical research was undertaken to take into account the latest techniques and recent works carried out by the scientific community on an international level in this domain.

This approach was based mainly on data published in indexed international reviews and on databases being consulted online (e.g. Web of Science).

PROPOSALS FOR GUIDELINES FOR MAPPING MAGNOLIOPHYTA SEAGRASSES IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

1 Problem

Today it is commonly recognized that the Mediterranean shallow coastal sea beds (between 0 and -50 m) host important ecosystems, such as the calcareous bio-concretions and magnoliophyta meadows (UNEP-MAP-Blue Plan, 2009).

These magnoliophyta are flowering plants of terrestrial origin which returned to the marine environment approx. 120 to 100 million of years and there are about sixty species throughout the world, five of which are in the Mediterranean (*Cymodocea nodosa*, *Halophila stipulacea*, *Posidonia oceanica*, *Zostera marina* and *Zostera noltii*; Fig. 1). They form extensive stretches of submarine prairies (still called meadows) between zero and about fifty m depth in the open sea, coastal lagoons (brackish and hyperhaline) and play an important ecological (primary production, spawning areas and nurseries) and sedimentary role (fixation of sediments & protection of the littoral; Pergent, 2006).

It is believed that on a worldwide level the submarine prairies, in view of their usefulness, have a major economic value (over 17 000 \$ per ha and per annum, in Costanza *et al.*, 1997).

Despite this it must be admitted that the available information on the exact geographical distribution of these meadows is still very fragmentary on a regional level (UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA, 2009) and that very little of the coastline has been inventoried as only 5 States out of the 21 have a mapped inventory covering at least half of their coasts (UNEP-MAP-Blue Plan 2009). To explain this situation, one of the reasons given is i) the often high cost of these inventories, ii) absence of specific technical means, iii) gaps in terms of competence on a local level and also iv) the multiplicity of tools available and the difficulty in identifying the most suitable methods to deal with a given situation.

Cymodocea nodosa (Ucria) Ascherson - Lesser Neptune grass

This warm – water species is présent throughout the Mediterranean and in the Atlantic (from Senegal to southern Spain).

It develops in the open sea between 0 and 10 m in depth (exceptionally until – 50 m) and in lagoons. Its serrated apex leaves (20 to 40 cm long and 3 to 4 mm wide) are regrouped in leaf bundles.its Brown reddish rhizomes are fine with foliar scarring.



© RAC/SPA, Gérard Pergent

Fig. 1: Presentation of Mediterranean magnoliophyta species. Distribution maps according to Green & Short (2003) updated.

Halophila stipulacea (Forssikal) Ascherson

A tropical affinity species, originating from the Red Sea and introduced into the Mediterranean via the Suez Canal.

It is présent throughout the whole Eastern basin, in the open sea. Between 1 and 35 m depth.

Its smal leaves (3 to 6 cm long and 3 to 8 mm wide) are regrouped in foliar bundles ; its mainly horizontal rhizomes are fine and clear.



© Yassine Ramzi Sghaier



Posidonia oceanica (Linnaeus) Delile - Posidonia

A mediterranean endemic species which forms huge meadows between 0 and 43 m depth.

It is présent throughout the whole Mediterranean except in the extrême South – east, Upper Adriatic and the Gibraltar sector.

On average its leaves are 30 to 80 cm long and 1 cm wide and are regrouped in foliar bundles. Its Brown rhizomes and its roots constitute a particular structure : a mat.



© RAC/SPA, Gérard Pergent



Fig. 1: Presentation of Mediterranean magnoliophyta species. Distribution maps according to Green & Short (2003) updated (continued).

Zostera marina Linnaeus – Marine Zostera

A cold – water, widely distributed species (Atlantic, Pacific, Black Sea) it is basically to be found in the Northern Mediterranean.

It develops on the high seas and in lagoons, between 0 and 12 m depth.

Its ribbon – shaped leaves (40 to 60 cm long on average and 4 to 8 mm wide) are regrouped in foliar bundles ; its yellow and Brown rhizomes are very fine.



© Mathieu Foulquié



Zostera noltii Hornemann - The dwarf eelgrass Zostera

A more temperate species, it is présent throught the whole Mediterranean in the Atlantic (from Mauritania to Scandinavia) and the Black Sea.

It develops in the open sea and in lagoons at a depth of 0 to 3 m and can tolerate lengthy exposure.

Its ribbon – shaped leaves (10 to 20 cm long and 1 to 2 mm wide) are regrouped in foliar bundles, its light yellow to biege rhizomes are very fine.



© Mathieu Foulquié



Fig. 1: Presentation of Mediterranean magnoliophyta species. Distribution maps according to Green & Short (2003) updated (continued).

2. Which approach to be taken?

The approach advocated for mapping the marine magnoliophyta meadows in the Mediterranean is similar to that established for the mapping of the marine habitats within the framework of the European MESH programme (Mapping European Seabed Habitats: MESH project 2008).

The different actions to be undertaken (Fig.2) are detailed below and can be regrouped into three main stages:

- ◆ Initial planning
- ◆ Proper surveys
- ◆ Processing and interpretation of data

Initial Planning means the identification of the objective so as to determine the surface to be mapped and the necessary precision to achieve the targeted objective. These are two fundamental elements to determine the tools to be used in the later phase & to evaluate the effort (and thus the human, material & financial costs) necessary to produce the mapping. This is the key-phase for a successful mapping approach.




Fig. 2 : Planning cycle of a habitats mapping programme (according to the MESH project, 2008).

The survey phase is the practical phase for data collection. It is often the most costly phase as it generally requires in situ interventions with their attendant constraints (such as availability of personnel and technical means, competences, weather conditions etc.) which must be met to obtain reliable and reproducible data. There must also be a prior inventory phase of the already existing data for the sector being studied so as to reduce the amount of work or to have a better targeting of the work to be done.

The processing and data interpretation phase is doubtlessly the most complex phase as it necessitates knowledge and experience so that the data gathered can be usable. The products obtained must be evaluated to ensure their coherence and the validity of the results obtained.

a) What precision for what surface area to be mapped?

Selecting an appropriate scale is a critical stage in the planning phase (Mc Kenzie *et al.*, 2001). Even though there is no technical impossibility in using a high precision over large surface areas (or inversely), there is generally an inverse relationship between the precision used and the surface area to be mapped (Mc Kenzie *et al.*, 2001; Fig. 3.).

Thus the mapping objectives for large surface areas means using average precision levels insofar as what is wanted is a global approach and even a probable habitat distribution or an identification of its extension limits. This type of approach is used for national or sub-regional studies and the minimum mapped surface area is 25 m² (Pergent *et al.*, 1995a). Inversely, mapping objectives for smaller surface areas often necessitate a much higher precision level (minimum surface area below or equal to square-meter: Pergent *et al.*, 1995a). What is sought here is an accurate localization of the habitat for control and monitoring purposes over a period of time. This type of approach is used for test-zones or remarkable sites to be most accurately monitored. As highlighted by the MESH Project (2008), most of the environment management and marine area planning activities require a range of habitat maps between these two extremes.




Fig. 3: scale and precision of a map

b) What available tools for mapping surveys?

In less than half a century the mapping survey techniques have become highly diversified and several of them have been successfully applied to marine magnoliophyta meadows (see synthesis in Walker, 1089: Pergent *et al.*, 1995a; McKenzie *et al.*, 2001; Dekker *et al.*, 2006; POSIDONIA project, 2007). In as far as the mapping of these meadows was in shallow depths (0 to 50 m), it is possible to use optical imaging techniques (satellite images, multi or hyper spectral imaging, aerial photography) and acoustic techniques (side-scan sonar, mono- or multi-beam sonar). The simultaneous use of several instruments makes it possible to optimize the results as the information obtained is different but can be complementary (Tab. 1).

Tab. 1: Synthesis on main survey tools used for mapping marine magnoliophyta. Whenever possible, the bathymetric tranche and the surface area being used, accuracy, the area mapped per hour, the main interest or the limits of utilization are to be indicated with the corresponding bibliographical references.

Survey tool	Depth	Surface area to be mapped	Geometrical precision	Area mapped in km ² /hour	
Satellite images	from 0 to -20 m but adapted to tranche 0 to 10 m	Starting with a few km ² but esp. adapted to large surface areas (over 100 km ²)	From 0.5 m	Over 100 (Kenny <i>et al.</i> , 2003)	
Multispectral and/or hyperspectral images	From 0 to -25 m (Mumby & Edwards, 2002) but adapted to superficial tranches (up to -15 m; Gagnon <i>et al.</i> , 2008)	CASI used on surface areas of 50 km ² to 5000 km ² (Mumby & Edwards, 2002)	from 1 m (Mumby <i>et al.</i> , 2003)		
Aerial photos	from 0 to -20 m but adapted esp. to tranche of 0 to -10 m	Adapted to small surface areas (10 km ² ; in Diaz <i>et al.</i> , 2004) but can be used for surface areas over 100 km ²	from 0.3 m (Frederiksen <i>et al.</i> , 2003)	over 10 (Kenny <i>et al.</i> , 2003)	
Side-scan sonar	over -8 m (Clabaut <i>et al.</i> , 2006)	Can be used for large surface area but adapted to medium surface areas (some dozens of km ²).	From 0.1 m (Kenny <i>et al.</i> , 2003)	0.8 to 3.5 (Kenny <i>et al.</i> , 2003)	
Acoustic sonar mono-beam acoustic sonar	beyond -10 m (Riegl & Purkis, 2005)		From 0.5 m (Riegl & Purkis, 2005)	1.5 (Kenny <i>et al.</i> , 2003)	
Multi-beam sonar	from -2 m to -8 m (Komatsu <i>et al.</i> , 2003)		From 1 m (Kenny <i>et al.</i> , 2003)	0.2 (Komatsu <i>et al.</i> , 2003)	
Transect or permanent square	Bathymetric tranche easily accessible with scuba diving (0-20 m) but esp. adapted to 0 to -10m tranche	Surface areas under km ² , generally 25 m to 100 m ² for permanent squares (Pergent <i>et al.</i> , 1995a)	from 0.1 m	0.01	


Interest	Limit
<p>Usable everywhere without authorization, high geometric precision. Possible to find free access images with low resolution but useful for superficial areas.</p>	<p>Good weather conditions required (no clouds & no wind). Possibility of confusion between close tonality population (e.g. seagrass on rock & photophilic population on rock). Interpretation error due to bathymetric variations (the same meadow may have different tonalities depending on whether it is at -3 m or at -10 m).</p>
<p>Very high spectral resolution which makes it possible to distinguish the magnoliophyta species (Dekker <i>et al.</i>, 2006). Possible to obtain data in bad weather.</p>	<p>Complex acquisition & processing procedures requiring the presence of specialists. Necessary to obtain field data & spectral data at the same time & to possess plenty of data to validate the observations. Identification difficulty in case of very fragmented populations (Dekker <i>et al.</i>, 2006).</p>
<p>Possible to adapt image precision to sought after objective (Pergent <i>et al.</i>, 1995a) Manual, direct & easy interpretation possible. Sizeable images library with access to chronological series. Good identification of limits between populations.</p>	<p>Same limit as for satellite imaging. Difficult geometrical corrections and strong deformations if verticality is not respected or if image covers a small area (low altitude view). Authorisations for imaging difficult to obtain in some countries.</p>
<p>Realistic representation of seabed & good identification of limits of facies & quite dense meadows. Quick execution.</p>	<p>Small forms (under m²) or low surface density cannot be distinguished (Paillard <i>et al.</i>, 1993). Loss of definition at image edge & slight adjustment between profiles necessary. Great signal amplitude variations (levels of grey) which can lead to interpretation errors (same population may appear in different levels of grey; Kenny <i>et al.</i>, 2003)</p>
<p>Good geo-referencing</p>	<p>Low discrimination between habitats & less reliable than satellite techniques</p>
<p>Possible to obtain 3 D image of meadows & gain biomass information per surface area unit.</p>	<p>Huge amount of data necessitating very efficient computer systems for processing & archiving. Complex data processing.</p>
<p>Very great precision in identifying small structures (tufts of seagrass) & localisation of population limits</p>	<p>Many working hours or necessitating numerous observers</p>

Tab. 1: Synthesis of main survey tools used for mapping marine magnoliophyta – next.

Survey tool	Depth	Surface area to be mapped	Geometrical precision	Area mapped in km ² /hour	
Video camera	Whole bathymetric tranche of seagrass distribution	Adapted to small surface areas under km ²	from 0.1 m (Kenny <i>et al.</i> , 2003)	0.2 (in Diaz <i>et al.</i> , 2004)	
Laser-telemetry	Bathymetric tranche easily accessible in scuba diving (0-20 m)	Adapted to small surface areas under km ²	Some centimeters (Descamp <i>et al.</i> , 2005)	0.01	
GIB	Bathymetric tranche easily accessible in free scuba diving (0-20 m)	Adapted to small surface areas under km ²			



Interest	Limit
Easy to use & possible to record seabed images for later interpretation	Long time to gain & process data Positioning error due to gap between boat's position & camera when dragged (POSIDONIA project, 2007)
Very accurate localisation of population limits or remarkable structures. Monitoring possible in course of time.	Range limited to 100m in relationship to base so not possible to work over large surface areas. Necessity for markers on seabed for positioning of base if monitoring over time is envisaged Possible acoustic signal perturbation due to great variations in temperature or salinity. Specific training needed for equipment. (Descamp <i>et al.</i> , 2005)
Same characteristic as acoustic telemetry but greater range (1.5 km)	Quite cumbersome technique (a lot of equipment, team of divers and related equipment; POSIDONIA project, 2007)



Once the surveying is finished, the data obtained needs to be organized (type of data, the whole point of obtaining the data, producer organism, method used, site studied and acquisition date) so that the data can be used later on as well and be appropriately archived so that it can be easily consulted, does not deteriorate with time and can be easily integrated into similar data from other sources (MESH project, 2008).

1) Optical data

Satellite images are from satellites in orbit around the earth. Data is obtained continuously and today it is possible to buy data which can be of great precision (Tab. 2).

Tab. 2 : Types of satellites & precision of sensors used for mapping of marine magnoliophyta - : absence of data

Satellite	Panchromatic precision	Bibliographical reference on marine magnoliophyta
Landsat 7	15 m	Cerdeira-Estrada <i>et al.</i> , 2008
SPOT 5	2.5 m	Pasqualini <i>et al.</i> , 2005
IKONOS (HR)	1.0 m	Mumby & Edwards, 2002
QuickBird	0.7 m	POSIDONIA project, 2007
Geoeyes	0.5 m	-

It is also possible to ask for a specific programming of the satellite (programmed passing over an identified sector with specific requirements) but this entails a much higher cost.

The rough data must undergo a prior geometrical correction to compensate for errors due to the methods the images are obtained (e.g. errors of parallax, inclination of the satellite) before it can be used. Images already geo-referenced should also be obtained even if their cost is much higher than the rough data.

In view of the changes of the light spectrum depending on the depth, these techniques should be reserved for superficial bathymetric tranches (Tab. 1). In clear water it can be said that:

- ◆ With the blue channel it is possible to see up to approx. 20 to 25 m depth
- ◆ With the green channel up to 15 to 20 m
- ◆ With the red channel up to 5 to 7 m
- ◆ Channel close to infra-red – approx. tens of cm (POSIDONIA project, 2007) and experience in the Mediterranean has shown that for types of well differentiated seabeds (e.g. loose substrate/meadow) they can be used with no problem up to a depth of about twenty meters (UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA 2009b).

Multispectral or hyperspectral imaging is based on obtaining simultaneously images composed of numerous close and contiguous spectral bands (generally 100 or more). There is a wide variety of airborne sensors (CASI1, Deaedralus Airborne Thematic Mapper; Godet *et al.* 2009) which provide data in real

time and under unfavourable lighting conditions (Tab. 1). It is possible to create specific spectral response libraries so that measured values can be compared and this makes it possible to appraise the vegetation cover and even to differentiate the component species (Ciraolo *et al.*, 2006; Dekker *et al.*, 2006).

Aerial photographs obtained through various means (e.g. aeroplanes, drones, ULM etc.) may have different technical characteristics (e.g. Shooting altitude, verticality, optical quality...). Even though more expensive, shooting films from a plane which is equipped with an altitude and verticality control system and using large size negatives (24 x 24) makes it possible to make better use of the results (e.g. geometrical precision). For example, on a photo at 1/25000 the surface area covered is 5.7 km x 5.7 km (Denis *et al.*, 2003). In view of the progress made in the last few decades in terms of shooting (e.g. the quality of the film, filters, lens etc.) and later processing (e.g. digitalization, geo-referencing), aerial photographs today constitute one of the most preferred surveying methods for mapping marine magnoliophyta meadows (Mc Kenzie *et al.*, 2001; POSIDONIA project 2007).

2) Acoustic data

Sonar provides images of the seabed through the emission and reception of ultrasound. Amongst the main seabed acoustic mapping technologies, Kenny *et al.* (2003) distinguish: (1) wide acoustic beam systems like the side-scan sonar, (2) single beam sounders (e.g. RoxAnn®QTC-View®), (3) multiple narrow beam bathymetric systems and (4) multi-beam sounders (Fig. 4).

The **side-scan sonar** towfish with its fixed recorder emits acoustic signals. The images, or sonograms, obtained, indicate the distribution and the limits of the different entities over a surface area of 100 to 200 m along the pathway (Clabaut *et al.*, 2006); Tab. 1). The precision of the final mapped document partly depends on the means of positioning used by the boat (e.g. radiolocalisation or satellite positioning). The existence of a sonogram atlas (Clabaut *et al.*, 2006) could be helpful in interpreting the data.

Single-beam acoustic sounder is based on the simultaneous emission of two frequencies separated by several octaves (38 kHz and 200 kHz) so that information can be obtained about the seafloor characterization.

The sounder's acoustic response is different depending on whether the sound wave is reflected from an area covered or not covered by vegetation. (POSIDONIA project, 2007).

The **multi-beam sounder** (Fig. 4) makes it possible to precisely and rapidly obtain: (i) topographical images of the submarine relief (bathymetry), (ii) sonar images representing the local reflectivity of the seafloor and thus its nature (imagery). The instrument simultaneously measures the depth in several directions, determined by the system's receiver beams. These beams form a beam perpendicular to the axis of the ship. The seafloor can thus be explored over a wide band (5 to 7 times the depth) with a high degree of resolution (POSIDONIA project, 2007). 3D images of the seafloor are thus obtained and the meadows can be visualized and the biomass can be evaluated too (Komatsu *et al.*, 2003).

3) Samples and observations in situ

Field samples and observations provide discrete data (sampling of distinct points regularly spread out in a study area). They are vital for the validation of continuous information (complete coverage of surface areas on portions of the study sectors or along the pathway) obtained through the different survey instruments and must be sufficiently numerous and distributed appropriately so as to obtain the necessary precision and also in view of the heterogeneity of the habitats. As for the mapping of meadows such as *Cymodocea nodosa*, *Posidonia oceanica*, *Zostera marina* or *Zostera noltii*, destructive sampling (using dredger buckets, core samplers, trawls, dredgers) must be forbidden in view of the protected character of these species (UNEP-MAP 2009) and direct samples being taken by hand should be limited as much as possible.

Surface observations can also be made (e.g. bathyscope) by observers diving in or by using submarine imagery techniques such as photography and video. Photographic equipment and cameras can be mounted on a vertical structure, a sleigh or remotely-controlled vehicle (ROV). The cameras on a vertical structure are submerged over the side of the ship as it advances very slowly (under 1 knot), the sleighs are at the back of the ship and the ROVs have their own propulsion system and are remotely controlled from the surface (MESH project, 2008).




Fig. 4 : Multi-beam sonar working principle and examples of bathymetric recording (multi-beam sounder) and acoustic images (multi-beam sounder and side-scan sonar); www.ifremer.fr

The use of video cameras (or ROVs) during the survey operations makes it possible to see the images on the screen in real time, to identify or to locate any changes in the facies and any other characteristic element of the seafloor. After the maritime operations, the images are reviewed to have a cartographical restitution using GIS for each of the areas surveyed (POSIDONIA project, 2007). To facilitate and to improve the results obtained with these cameras, joint acquisition modules integrating the depth, images of the seafloor and geographical positioning have been developed (e.g. the TRITONE system or MOBIDIC; POSIDONIA project, 2007).

In situ observations can in fact constitute proper surveying techniques when they are used along the lines (transect) or over small surface areas (permanent square) marked accurately on the seabed and also to follow the limits of a population.

The transects consist of lines marked on the seafloor by means of graduated ribbons stretched from fixed points on the coast and in a precise direction (Boudouresque *et al.*, 1980 in Pergent *et al.*, 1995a). Any changes in the populations and types of seafloor over a surface area of 1 to 2 m on each side of the line are recorded. The information report makes it possible to prepare a precise map of the sector studied (Tab. 1).

Demarcating the limits of a meadow also makes it possible to obtain a distribution map. Laser-telemetry is a useful technique for highly precise mapping surveying over small surface areas (Descamp *et al.*, 2005). The GIB system (GPS Intelligent Buoys) has 4 buoys with hydrophones and GPS and a submarine acoustic emitter is quite comparable. The buoys measure the arrival time of an acoustic signal whose emission is synchronous with the GPS time. Knowing the moment of emission of these signals and the sound propagation speed in the water, it is possible to directly calculate the distances between the pinger and the 4 buoys. The depth is indicated by the pressure sensor. To optimize the meadows mapping operations, the pinger can be fixed on a submarine scooter driven by a diver. The maximum distance of the pinger in relationship to the center of the polygon formed by the 4 buoys can be approx. 1500 m (POSIDONIA project, 2007).

Free diving monitoring with a differential GPS can also be envisaged to locate the upper limits of the meadows. The diver follows precisely the contours of the limits and the DGPS continuously records the diver's geographical data. The mapping data is integrated under GIS using the route followed. The acquisition speed is 2-3 km/hour; the sensor precision can be sub metric (POSIDONIA project, 2007).

c) What methods of analysis to interpret the data?

The MESH (2008) project identified three prior stages for the production of a habitats map:

- ◆ Processing, analysis and classification of the biological data,
- ◆ Selecting the most appropriate physical layers (e.g. substrate, bathymetry, hydro dynamism)
- ◆ Integration and modeling of data by collating biological habitats classes and physical layers and then regrouping similar corresponding groupings, direct interpretation of acoustic and optical images by having recourse to the practical experience of the experts or statistical modeling.

The map thus produced must then be evaluated for its accuracy, i.e. its capacity to represent reality as it truly is, its accuracy and therefore its reliability.


During the **processing analysis and classification stage**, the reference list of the Mediterranean habitat types should be consulted (UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA, 1999) which was adopted by the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention at their 11th ordinary meeting. This list identified the specific "meadow" habitats which are also to be found in the annex of the Habitats Directive (Directive 92/43/EEC of the 21 May 1992 Council) and which must be taken into consideration within the framework of the NATURA 2000 programmes (Fig. 5).

A precise description of the reference habitats and the criteria to identify them are also available (Bellan-Santini *et al.*, 2004). In view of this classification, the habitats which could be on the map are as follows:


- ◆ *Cymodocea nodosa* meadows
- ◆ *Halophila stipulacea* meadows
- ◆ *Posidonia oceanica* meadows
- ◆ *Zostera marina* meadows
- ◆ *Zostera noltii* meadows
- ◆ Mixed meadows (a mix of the preceding species)

As for *Posidonia oceanica* meadows, the discontinuous meadows (on a rock or sand) should be identified, the dead mats and natural monuments such as:

- ◆ Striped meadows
- ◆ Barrier reefs and reef platforms
- ◆ Atolls (micro or macro-atolls)



© RAC/SPA, Renaud DUPUY DE LA GRANDRIVE



| © Gérard Pergent



| © Sandrine Ruitton

I. SUPRALITTORAL

I.1. MUDDS

I.2. SAND

I.2.1. Biocenosis of supralittoral sands

I.2.1.5. Facies of phanerogams which have been washed ashore (upper part)

I. 3. STONES AND PEBBLES

I.4. HARD BEDS AND ROCKS

II. MEDIOLITTORAL

II.1. MUDDS, SANDY MUDDS AND SANDS

II.2. SUNDS

II.3. STONES AND PEBBLES

II.3.1. Biocenosis of mediolittoral coarse detritic bottoms

II.3.1.1. Facies of banks of dead leaves of *P. oceanica* and other phanerogams

II.4. HARD BEDS AND ROCKS

III. INFRALITTORAL

III.1. SANDY MUDDS, SANDS, GRAVELS AND ROCKS IN EURYHALINE AND EURYTHERMAL ENVIRONMENT

III.1.1. Euryhaline and eurythermal Biocenosis

III.1.1.4. Association with *Zostera noltii* in euryhaline and eurythermal environment

III.1.1.5. Association with *Zostera marina* in euryhaline and eurythermal environment

III.2. FINE SANDS WITH MORE OR LESS MUD

III.2.1. Biocenosis of fine sand of high level

III.2.2. Biocenosis of well sorted fine sands

III.2.2.1. Association with *Cymodocea nodosa* on well sorted fine sands

III.2.2.2. Association with *Halophila stipulacea*

III.2.3. Biocenosis of superficial muddy sands in sheltered waters

III.2.3.4. Association with *Cymodocea nodosa* on superficial muddy sands in sheltered waters

III.2.3.5. Association with *Zostera noltii* on superficial muddy sands in sheltered waters

III.3. CORSE SAND WITH MORE OR LESS MUD

III.4. STONES AND PEBBLES

III.5. POSIDONIA OCEANICA MEADOWS

III.5.1. *Posidonia oceanica* meadows (association with *Posidonia oceanica*)

III.5.1.1. Ecomorphosis of stripped meadows

III.5.1.2. Ecomorphosis of “barrier-reef” meadows

III.5.1.3. Facies of dead matte of *Posidonia oceanica* without important epiflora

Fig. 5: Extract from Reference list of Mediterranean habitats (UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA. 1999), only those habitats in connection with marine magnoliophyta are indicated.

As these assemblages are generally small in size, they can only be identified with high (metric) precision mapping.

The selection of physical layers may be an interesting approach within the general framework of mapping marine habitats so as to reduce the processing time but it is of little use for the Mediterranean meadows in as far as none of the classical physical parameters (e.g. substrate, depth, hydro dynamism, or salinity) are discerning enough to forecast the distribution of species (Fig. 6).




Fig. 6 : Distribution of the marine magnoliophyta species depending on the nature of the substrate and the depth in the Mediterranean

The data integration and modeling stage will differ depending on the survey tools and the acquisition strategy used. In view of their acquisition rapidity, aerial techniques usually make it possible to completely cover the littoral and the shallow intertidal zones which are to be mapped and this greatly reduces interpolation. Inversely, surveys from vessels which are often limited because of the time factor and costs involved, only rarely make it possible to obtain a complete coverage of the site. Coverage under 100 % automatically means that it is impossible to obtain high resolution maps and therefore interpolation techniques have to be used so that from partial surveys a lower resolution map can be prepared (MESH project 2008, Fig. 7).




Fig. 7 : Example of partial coverage survey (left) and produced through interpolation (right). The area surveyed was approx. 20 km wide (MESH project, 2008).

An “overlapping” survey strategy combining a partial coverage of a large surface area and a more detailed coverage of smaller zones of particular interest could be an interesting compromise.

To obtain a potential meadows distribution map, it might be useful to have precision mapping only of the extension limits (upper and lower) of the population, and the presence between these two limits could be reduced to occasional investigations and interpolation could play its part. (Pasqualini *et al.*, 1998). The processing and digital analysis of data (whether optical or acoustic) makes it possible on the basis of in situ observations to create plots which associate tonalities of grey, facies or textures with a type of population and to generalize this information to the whole image thus creating the map which in turn should at least make it possible to identify the loose substrates, hard substrates and the magnoliophyta meadows. Specific processing (e.g. analysis of the roughness, filtering and thresholding) make additional information accessible such as the seagrass cover or the presence of anthropogenic traces (Pasqualini *et al.*, 1999).

To facilitate a comparison of the sites, a single graphic representation should be adopted for each type of population (Fig. 8). When the cartographical precision is good enough, it is possible to indicate the discontinuous meadows which are characterized by a coverage below 50 %, (the colour of the spots makes it possible to identify the species concerned) or the two main species which constitute a mixed meadow. As for *Posidonia oceanica* striped meadows and the atolls, no representative plan is envisaged as these are typical forms (bands, circular structures) which are easily identifiable.

The results should be integrated into the GIS (Geographical Information System) so that they can be consulted and used later on much more easily.




Fig. 8 : graphic representation of the main marine magnoliophyta assemblages. RVB: values in red, green and blue for each type of meadow.

Thus by making a comparison with previous data (bibliographical data), it is possible to note any changes in some of the populations over a period of time (Mc Kenzie *et al.*, 2001; Barsanti *et al.*, 2007).

The reliability of the map produced should also be questioned. Several evaluation scales have already been proposed and may

be useful for the magnoliophyta meadows. Denis *et al.*, 2003, propose a reliability index of the bibliographical cartographical data based on the map scale (scale of 5; Fig. 9), the mode of positioning (scale of 5; Fig. 9) and the observation acquisition method (scale of 10; Tab. 3).


Valeur de l'indice	0	1	2	3	4	5
Echelle de la carte (e)						
$\geq 1/500\ 000$	↑					
$1/100\ 000 < e \leq 1/500\ 000$		↑				
$1/50\ 000 < e \leq 1/100\ 000$			↑			
$1/25\ 000 < E \leq 1/50\ 000$				↑		
$1/5\ 000 < E \leq 1/25\ 000$					↑	
$E \leq 1/5\ 000$						↑
Mode de Positionnement						
Aucun positionnement	↑					
Photographies $\leq 1/2000$ sans correction	↑					
Photographies $\geq 1/2000$ sans correction		↑				
Photographies avec correction selon trait de côte référencé						
Photographies avec correction selon données terrain relevée au GPS non différentiel					↑	
Photographies avec correction selon données terrain relevée au GPS différentiel						↑

Fig. 9: Attribution criteria of the scale/rating corresponding to the parameter “map scale” and to the “mode of positioning” parameter of the reliability index of old maps (according to Denis *et al.*, 2003 modified).

The reliability index (from 0 to 20) can vary from one point to another of the map depending on the bathymetry or the technique used. Pasqualini (1997) proposes a reliability scale in relationship to the image processing of the aerial photos (Tab. 4.) which can also be applied to satellite images or another one in relationship to the processing of sonograms. (Tab. 5). Reliability lower than or equal to 50 % means that the author should try to

improve the reliability (increasing the number of segments during image processing for example) or else the scale needs to be adapted. Even though this is hardly ever mentioned, apart from the map, it seems to be important to provide information on the distribution, the number and the percentage of data acquired so as to distinguish between what is interpolation and what is the actual field data.

Tab. 3 : Attribution criteria of the scale corresponding to the “data acquisition mode” parameter of the reliability index of old maps (Denis et al., 2003).

PROFONDEUR DE 0 À 5 M						
Mode d'acquisition	Sonar	Prélèvement, observations ponctuelles, balisages, etc.		Images satellites	Photographies aériennes ou Images satellites + vérités-terrain	Photographies aériennes + vérités terrain
Note (/10)	0	0 à 6 selon la maille (M)		6	8	10
		M ≥ 1000 m	0			
		1000 m > M ≥ 500 m	1			
		500 m > M ≥ 250 m	2			
		250 m > M ≥ 100 m	3			
		100 m > M ≥ 50 m	4			
		50 m > M ≥ 20 m	5			
		20 m > M	6			
PROFONDEUR DE 5 A 15 M						
Mode d'acquisition	Prélèvement, observations ponctuelles, balisages, etc.	Images satellites	Photographies aériennes ou Images satellites + vérités-terrain	Sonar	Photographies aériennes et/ou sonar + vérités terrain	
Note (/10)	0 à 6 selon la maille (M)	4	6	8	10	
PROFONDEUR DE 15 A 40 M						
Mode d'acquisition	Photographies aériennes	Images satellites	Prélèvement, observations ponctuelles, balisages, etc.	Sonar	Sonar + vérités terrain	
Note (/10)	0	0	0 à 6 selon la maille (M)	8	10	

Tab. 4 : Attribution criteria of the reliability index of maps produced through image processing from aerial photos.
 * Criterion subdivided into two elements, each being weighted with a coefficient of 0.5 (Pasqualini, 1997).

Reliability scale	3 points	2 points	1 point	0 point
CRITERIA				
Site studied				
Topography : slope	Low & constant	Low & irregular	Strong & constant	Strong & irregular
bathymetric tranche	0 à 5 m	0 à 10 m	0 à 20 m	0 to over 20 m
Water turbidity: Visualisation of populations & types of seafloors	100 % of bathymetric tranche studied	75 % of bathymetric tranche studied	50 % of bathymetric tranche studied	< 50 % of bathymetric tranche studied
Nature of populations & types of seafloors	Very different	Différent	Close	Very close
Film shooting				
Quality	Very good	good	medium	Poor
Surface effects : lens réflexion wave	No surface effect	Surface effect far from site	Surface effect close to site	Surface effect on site
Digitalisation				
pixel size	Pixel \leq 2m	2m < Pixel \leq 5m	5m < Pixel \leq 10m	Pixel > 10m
Geometrical correction				
*Control points : Number Distribution	Number \geq 20 In 4 directions	20 > Number \geq 10 In 3 directions	10 > Number \geq 4 In 2 directions	Number < 4 In 1 direction
Referentiel scale image scale	Referentiel > image	Referentiel = image	Referentiel < image	Referentiel << image
Field data				
Surface covered by field data / study surface area	Surface \geq 10 % of study surface area	10 % > Surface \geq 5 % of study area	5 % > Surface \geq 1 % of study area	Surface < 1 % of study area
Classification				
No. of polygons per population or type of seafloor	number > 30	30 \geq number > 15	15 \geq number > 5	number < 5
Total	33			

Tab. 5 : Attribution criteria of reliability index of maps prepared through sonogram processing (Pasqualini, 1997).

Reliability scale	3 points	2 points	1 point	0 point
CRITERIA				
Site studied				
Nature of populations & types of seafloors	Very different	Different	Close	Very close
Topography : slope	Low & constant	Low & irregular	Stropng & constant	Strong & irregular
Acquisition of sonograms				
Quality	Very good	Good	Medium	Poor
Presence of artefacts	No artéfact	Some artifacts on edges of sonogram	Some artifacts over whole sonogram	many artifacts over whole sonogram
Positioning of sonograms				
Precision	Precision = 1 m	1 m < Precision ≤ 10 m	10 m < Precision ≤ 20 m	Precision > 20 m
Recovery of sonar profiles				
Surface prospected with sonar / Surface area studied	100 % of study area	over 50 % of study area	over 25 % of study area	Less than 25 % of study area
Field data				
ISurface area covered by field data / study surface area	Surface ≥ 10 % of study area	10 % > Surface ≥ 5 % of study area	5 % > Surface ≥ 1 % of study area	Surface < 1 % of study area
Interpretation precision				
Manual Interpretation (scale of sonograms)	1/500	1/1 000	1/2 000	1/4 000
Or image processing (digitalisation)	Pixel ≤ 1 m	1 m < Pixel ≤ 2 m	2 m < Pixel ≤ 3 m	Pixel > 3 m
TOTAL	24			

3. Case Studies

The following summarized case studies do not constitute “turnkey solutions” for the managers and decision-makers who want to map the magnoliophyta meadows, in asfar as preparing a map is always the result of a compromise between:

- ◆ The surface area to be processed (country, region, site),
- ◆ The desired precision, not only for the surface area but also in view of the mapping objectives and the means available,
- ◆ The bathymetric tranche concerned,
- ◆ The technical means available, the necessary competences to implement the techniques, the time required and the available budget,
- ◆ Regulatory constraints (e.g. fly-over authorization, navigation restriction),
- ◆ Later use of data (e.g. integration into a GIS, scheduled monitoring in time, comparison with other existing or programmed cartographical data).

All these, however, are practical operations carried out in the Mediterranean for which the implementation costs are available for the sake of information. Even though several authors tried to assess the economic costs pertaining to the use of one or other of the surveying techniques (Mumby *et al.*, 1999; Denis *et al.*, 2003; Pin *et al.*, 2008; Godet *et al.*, 2009), the values obtained are difficult to transpose to other sites.

a) Distribution of *Posidonia oceanica* meadows along the coast of Corsica (Pasqualini, 1997)

Objective: Management and planning of the area - to have a general distribution map of the *P. oceanica* meadows and the main types of seafloors along the coast of Corsica.

Surface area to be mapped: whole coastline (1000 km)

Bathymetric tranche: 0 to -40 m

Expected precision: from 10 to 50 m linear

Regulatory constraints: presence of several protected areas and a military base

Data Processing:

- ◆ Superficial tranche (0 to -15 m): 650 aerial photos at 1/20 000 + field data.
- ◆ Deep tranche (20 to -40 m): 2 oceanographical seasons using side-scan sonar (i.e. approx. thirty mission days and 1200 km of profile) + field data.

Traitement des données :

Aerial photographs (24 x 24) digitalized with an A3 scanner in 16.8 million colour, with a pixel of 5 m (102 dpi). Image processing with the Multiscope (©Matra CapSystem) software. Supervised classification. Geographical referential: BD-Ortho (©IGN). Manual processing of sonograms for the position of the lower limit and image processing for the coverage and the presence of anthropogenic traces. Geographical referential: route of vessel – Differential GPS.

Implementation Time: 36 man/months - work of a thesis student + supervision.

Cost: 130 000 €

Results:

Identification of soft substrates, hard substrates, continuous *P. oceanica* meadows and meadow mosaics (weak coverage degraded meadow or mixed meadows with *P. oceanica* and other magnoliophyta).




Fig. 10: Map of main populations and types of seafloors (left) and Reliability map (right) of Cap Corse (Pasqualini, 1997).

b) Cartographie de la limite supérieure des herbiers de Tunisie (PNUE-PAM-CAR/ASP, 2009b)

Objective: Management and development of an area: - to have a fairly precise map of the upper limits of magnoliophyta meadows for the medium term monitoring of anthropogenic pressures.

Surface area to be mapped: Ssector between Port El Kantaoui and Monastir (25 km)

Bathymetric tranche: 0 to -15 m

Expected precision: from 5 to 10 m linear

Regulatory constraints: administrative authorizations

Surveying Tools:

ISatellite images SPOT 5 in 2.5. m and Google Earth + surface observations (bathyscope) and free diving.

Data processing:

Image processing with the ENVI IV® software supervised classification. Geographical referential. GPS points for limit monitoring.

Implementation time: 8 man/days

Costs: 6 000 €

Results:

Identification of natural and anthropogenic impacts, soft substrates, hard substrates, *C. nodosa* and *P. oceanica* meadows.

Preparation of a reference map (Fig. 11).




Fig. 11: Map of main populations and types of seafloors of the littoral towards Port El Kantaoui (UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA, 2009c).

c) Mapping of magnoliophyta meadows at the aquaculture installation in the Balearic Islands (Delgado et al., 1999)

Objective: Monitoring of impact of anthropogenic activity – To have a precise map of the seafloors at the aquaculture installations set up on the meadows so as to evaluate any impacts.

Surface area to be mapped: T100 m transects in the area where aquaculture structures were set up (< 2000 m²).

Bathymetric tranche: from -5 to -8 m

Expected precision: from 1 to 2 m linear

Regulatory constraints: authorizations required from the operator

Surveying Tools:

Transects dealt with using free scuba diving + samples taken

Data Processing:

Manual data processing (Fig. 12).

Implementation time: 2 men/days per year, with monitoring over several years.

Cost: 5 000 €

Results:

Identification of loose substrates, *C. nodosa* and *P. oceanica* meadows and their state of health (Fig. 13). Visualization of impact of aquaculture activity on the meadows over several years.

d) Mapping of magnoliophyta meadows in view of the organized berthing in Corsica (Salivas-Decaux et al., 2008).

Objective: Reducing the impact of an anthropogenic activity – to have a precise map of the meadows so as to prepare a sensitivity map of the populations vis-à-vis foreign berthing and to propose installing organized berthing in less sensitive sectors.

Surface area to be mapped: 0.03 km² bay

Bathymetric tranche: from 0 to -15 m

Expected precision: 1 to 2 m linear

Regulatory constraints: none

Surveying Tools:

Aerial photos (24 x 24) digitalized with an A3 scanner in 16.8 million colors, with a pixel of 1 m (127 dpi). Image processing with ENVI IV® software.

Data Processing:

Photographies aériennes (24 x 24) numérisées avec un scanner A3 en 16,8 Millions de couleur, avec un pixel de 1 m (127 dpi). Traitement des images avec le logiciel ENVI IV®.

Implementation time: 10 man/days

Cost: 4 000 €

Results:

Identification of loose substrates, *C. nodosa* and *P. oceanica* meadows and their state of health (degraded meadows and dead mats (Fig. 13)). To prepare a sensitivity map to berthing impacts and to propose an installation plan for organized berthing.




Fig. 12 : Representation of populations and types of seafloors at the aquaculture installations and changes in 1988, 1989 to 1990 (Delgado *et al.*, 1999).




Fig. 13 : Map of main populations and types of seafloors at the Girolata bay (left) and map of sensitivity to berthing (right). Setting up berthing installations should be considered in the yellow sectors - Salivas-Decaux *et al.*, 2008).

PROPOSALS FOR GUIDELINES FOR MONITORING MAGNOLIOPHYTA MEADOWS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

1. Problem

The monitoring of marine magnoliophyta has today become a necessity and even an obligation for numerous Mediterranean countries due to the fact that:

- ◆ Four out of the five species present in the Mediterranean (*C. nodosa*, *P. oceanica*, *Z. marina* and *Z. noltii*) are in Annex 2 (List of endangered or threatened species) of the Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity (Decision of the 16th Ordinary meeting of the Contracting Parties, Marrakech, 3-5 November 2009; UNEP-MAP, 2009),
- ◆ Three (*C. nodosa*, *P. Oceanica* and *Z. marina*) are in Annex 1 (strictly protected flora species) of the Bern Convention concerning the Mediterranean geographical region and
- ◆ The marine magnoliophyta meadows constitute one of the priority natural habitats of the European Directive No. 92/43 (EEC, 1992).

This regulatory “recognition” also means that efficient management measures are required to ensure that these habitats and the constituent species are and remain in a satisfactory state of health to look after them.

2. What steps to be taken?

What is to be done next is to set up a marine magnoliophyta meadows monitoring system comparable to that for mapping with the following stages:

- ◆ Initial planning
- ◆ Setting up the monitoring system
- ◆ Monitoring over time and analysis

The initial planning is to define the objective(s) and to determine the duration, identify the sites to be monitored, choose the parameters to be implemented with their acquisition modalities (sampling strategy) and evaluate the human, technical and financial needs to ensure implementation and sustainability. This phase therefore is not to be minimized.

The setting-up phase constitutes the actual operational phase as this is when the necessary monitoring structures will be set up (e.g. fixed markers) and may turn out to be expensive (equipment necessary for going out to sea, equipment and human resources) especially under difficult weather conditions.

This must be planned for a favorable season especially as depending on the parameters chosen for monitoring purposes, return trips must be undertaken during the same period. This phase might be quite long especially if numerous sites are to be monitored.

Monitoring over a period of time and the analysis phase seem to be easy as data acquisition is a routine operation with no major difficulties if the preceding phases had been carried out correctly (e.g. evaluation of needs). It often constitutes the key element of the monitoring system as it makes it possible to:

- ◆ Interpret the acquired data
- ◆ Demonstrate its validity and interest and
- ◆ Check that the monitoring objectives have been attained.

This phase may be quite complex as the data analysis necessitates clear scientific competence and in order to be useful, it must be envisaged over the medium term at least.



© Sandrine Ruitton

a) Monitoring – why and how?

The aim of monitoring the marine magnoliophyta is generally to:

- ◆ Monitor to preserve and conserve the heritage, with the aim of ensuring that the meadows as priority habitats are in a satisfactory state of conservation and also identify as early on as possible any degradation of these priority habitats or any changes in their distribution.
- ◆ Initiate a global monitoring of the quality of the environment. The magnoliophyta are used as indicators of “biological quality” (according to the European Water Framework Directive, DCE/2000/60 CE). The “good state of the meadows” makes it possible to measure the efficacy of local or regional policies in terms of the management of the coastal environment (e.g. water treatment to be improved, less contaminants etc. Boudouresque *et al.*, 2006).
- ◆ Exercise control over development works. This type of monitoring aims to establish a “zero” state before the works began, then monitor the state of health of the meadow during the development works phase or at the end of the phase to check any likely impacts.

These objectives can converge, as in the case of the Posidonia Monitoring Networks, initiated in the Region Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur since 1984, where the objective was the conservation of the *Posidonia oceanica* meadows and also their use as a global indicator of the quality of the marine waters (Boudouresque *et al.*, 2000). The objective(s) chosen will then be the parameters of the

other stages (.e.g. duration, sites to be monitored, parameters for measuring, no sampling; Tab. 6).

In general and irrespective of the objective advocated, it is judicious initially to focus on a small number of sites which are easily accessible and which can be regularly monitored (Pergent & Pergent-Martini, 1995).

Tab. 6 : Monitoring criteria depending on the objectives.

Monitoring objective	Sites to be studied	Parameters to be taken into account	Monitoring duration & no data acquisition time
Heritage monitoring	Monitoring of site with little anthropogenic disturbances or reference site (i.e. Protected Areas) to glean information on the natural evolution of the environment (Pergent & Pergent-Martini, 1995)	Geographical extension limit of meadow. Parameters of state of health of meadow (e.g. cover, density, div. into plots)	Medium and long term monitoring (min. 10 years). Data acquisition at least annually for non persistent species and 2 to 3 years for perennial species. (Boudouresque <i>et al.</i> ,2000)
Monitoring of quality of environment	Identify anthropogenic pressures likely to affect the quality of the environment and initiate monitoring in at least 2 sites, one reference site and one site with anthropogenic pressures most representative of the littoral studied (Pergent & Pergent-Martini, 1995)	Meadow parameters indicating the quality of the environment (e.g. turbidity, depth of lower limit, enhancement in nutrients, nitrogen content of leaves, chemical contamination, trace metals in plant.)	Medium term monitoring (at least 5 to 8 years) Data acquisition is variable depending on the species concerned (one to three years)
Impact control of development works	Monitoring of site subject to development works	Specific parameters to be defined depending on the probable consequences of the development works.	Short term monitoring (generally 1 to 2 years) Initiated before the works (« zero state ») it can be continued during, or just after, & control to be made one year after the end of the works. No data acquisition, generally reduced (monthly or occasionally before and after the development works.

The sites chosen must be i) representative of the portion of the coast studied (nature of the substrate), ii) cover the most complete possible range of situations and iii) regroup sensitive zones, stable zones or reference zones. Then, with the experience gained by the actors and the means available, this network could be extended to a greater number of sites.

Taking the marine magnoliophyta as an indicator of biological quality within the framework of the European Water Framework Directive, means that there has been an increase in the diversity of the descriptors to appraise the state of health of a meadow and thus these are parameters which can be measured. (Pergent-Martini *et al.*, 2005 ; Foden & Brazier, 2007 ; Romero *et al.*, 2007; Orfanidis *et al.*, 2010). Some of the most common descriptors (Tab. 7) use a standardized method (especially for *P. oceanica*; Pergent-Martini *et al.*, 2005), but there are still many disparities in data acquisition despite efforts to propose a common approach (Short & Coles, 2001; Buia *et al.*, 2004; Lopez Y Royo *et al.*, 2010a).

The requirements have to be evaluated to ensure the setting up and sustainability of the system and this constitutes the ultimate stage of the planning phase and it is also the most crucial phase. To ensure the sustainability of the system means:

- ◆ Identifying the partners, competences and means available
- ◆ Planning the partnership modalities (who is doing what? when? and how?)
- ◆ Ensure training for the stakeholders so that they can set up standardized procedures to guarantee the validity of the results, and so that comparisons can be made in the course of time for a given site and also from one site to another.
- ◆ To co-opt a regional or national coordinator depending on the number of sites concerned for monitoring and their geographical distribution and
- ◆ To budgeter the minimum funding necessary for the running of the network (such as permanent payroll, procurement costs and cost of running the equipment, data acquisition, processing and analysis costs)..



| © Sandrine Ruitton

Tab. 7 : Synthesis of main descriptors (1) used for monitoring marine magnoliophyta. Whenever possible, the measuring method (2), the expected response in case of increased anthropogenic pressure and the main factors likely to affect the descriptor (3), the destructive character of data acquisition (4), the species targeted (5), interest (6) or the limits of use (7) are indicated with the corresponding bibliographical references. The targeted species are: Cn - *Cymodocea nodosa*, Hs - *Halophila stipulacea*, Po - *Posidonia oceanica*, Zm - *Zostera marina*, Zn - *Zostera noltii*.

1 - Descriptor	2 - Measuring method	3 - Expected response/ factors of degradation	4 - Destruc charact
Population information			
Extension meadow surface area	Meadow mapping (Cf. Part I of present document) &/or identification of limits (Foden & Brazier, 2007)	Diminution Coastal developments Turbidity Mechanical effects	No
Bathymetric position of upper limit of meadow (in m)	Highly precise mapping of seagrass extension limit towards surface (Cf. Part I of present document) or placing of fixed markers (e.g. permanent transects, plots, acoustic system & measuring of depth	increase littoral developments	No
Bathymetric position of lower limit of meadow (in m)	Highly precise mapping of meadow extension limit in depth (Cf. Part I of present document) or recording of fixed markers (e.g. permanent transects buoys, acoustic system & depth measuring.	Diminution Turbidity	No
Meadow lower limit type	in situ observations	Change Turbidity Mechanical effects (e.g. trailing equipment	No
Density (number of bundles m ⁻²)	No. of beams (bundles) inside quadrant (fixed dimension & depth).quadrant size depends on species concerned. (Po see in Pergent-Martini <i>et al.</i> , 2005) & supposed meadow density (Duarte & Kirkman, 2001)	Diminution Turbidity Mechanical effects (e.g. anchoring)	No

5 - Target species	6 - Interest	7 - Limits
All	Descriptor integrator Usable everywhere in view of multiplicity of techniques available and for whole bathymetric tranche of distribution of meadows.	For slow growing species (Po) impossible to observe any increase in surface area in the absence of pre-positioned markers and long response time (several years). Obligated to always work during season where distribution is maximal for species with marked seasonal growth (generally in summer).
All	Easy-to-measure parameter. Interpretation scale available for Po (Pergent <i>et al.</i> , 2008)	For Cn, Hs & Zn, strong seasonal variability necessitating quarterly monitoring or observations at same season for all sites monitored. Fixed markers might disappear if site is strongly frequented.
All	Easy-to-measure parameter not requiring any particular competence & using free scuba diving, except if acoustic system is used Interpretation scale available (Po : Pergent <i>et al.</i> , 2008)	For Cn, Hs et Zn, strong seasonal variability necessitating quarterly monitoring or observations at same season for all sites monitored. Beyond 30 m depth, acquisition difficult & costly (limited submersion time, need for experienced divers and numerous interventions) fixed markers may disappear (e.g. trailing equipment). For slow growing species (Po) long time required to see any progress (several years).
Po	Well studied parameter & several types described & interpretation scales (Boudouresque & Meinesz, 1982 ; Pergent, 2007 ; Monte-falcone, 2009).	Good knowledge of Po meadows necessary to identify some types of limits. Difficult & costly acquisition in great depth (> 30 m)
All	Easy-to-measure & inexpensive parameter. Can be used for whole bathymetric tranche of meadow distribution Interpretation scale available for Po (Pergent <i>et al.</i> , 2008 ; Annex C)	Strong variability depending on depth. Long acquisition time for densities over 800 beams (bundles) Replicas necessary or sampling minimum surface area to evaluate meadow heterogeneity. Considerable risk of error if: a) manipulator is inexperienced, b) high density , c) small sized species & in such a case in situ counting can be replaced by sampling in a given area and the counting can be done in the lab. (Destructive technique).

Tab. 7 : Synthesis of main descriptors (1) used for monitoring marine magnoliophytes – next.

1 - Descriptor	2 - Measuring method	3 - Expected response/ factors of degradation	4 - Destruc charact
coverage (in %)	Average percentage of surface area occupied (in vertical projection) per meadow in relationship to surface area studied. Diverse techniques to measure this parameter in situ measuring by diver or in lab. Using submarine photos or video, variable observation surface area (0.16 to 625 m ²), represented by quadrant or translucent plaque; Pergent-Martini <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Boudouresque <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Romero <i>et al.</i> , 2007)	Diminution Turbidity	No
Percentage of plagiotropic rhizomes (in %)	Counting of plagiotropic rhizomes in a given surface area (which can be represented by a quadrat)	Increase/mechanical effects (anchoring, fishing gear)	No
Presence of inter-mat channels & dead mats	Highly precise mapping of site (Cf. Part I of present document, permanent square) &/or in situ observations Percentage of dead mats & live meadow can be used as a perturbation index. (CI = L/(L+D) ; CI : index of conservation, L : meadow surface area , D :surface area dead mats ; Moreno <i>et al.</i> , 2001 in Boudouresque <i>et al.</i> , 2006).	Increase/mechanical effects anchoring, fishing gear	No
Plant information			
Foliar surface area (cm ² .bundle), & other phenological characteristics	Counting & measuring the length & width of different types of leaf bundles. (Po : Giraud, 1979 ; Cn : Orfanidis <i>et al.</i> 2010)	Foliar surface area (Po) - Diminution Overgrazing & anthropogenic impacts. Length of leaves. (Po & Cn) – Augmentation nutriments enhancemen	Yes

	5 - Target species	6 - Interest	7 - Limits
	All	<p>Rapid acquisition. If evaluation on basis of photographic data, then possibility of comparison over time period & less variability due to manipulator. Applicable to whole bathymetric tranche of seagrass distribution. . Can be estimated over large surface areas based on aerial photos or sonograms (side-scan sonar)</p>	<p>Strong seasonal & bathymetric variability (e.g. for Po coverage of 100 % at upper limit at 40 % for lower limit for healthy meadow in Boudouresque <i>et al.</i>, 2006). Multiples methods used do not always allow comparisons to be made of the results obtained as observation surface areas are very diverse & coverage is fractal. (Romero, comm. pers.). Sampling plan must be adapted to include spatial variability.</p>
	Cn, Po	<p>Easy, rapid & inexpensive parameter in shallow depths (0 to 20 m).interpretation scale available for Po (Charbonnel <i>et al.</i>, 2000 in Boudouresque <i>et al.</i>, 2006)</p>	
	Po	<p>Easy-to-use parameter. Possible to quantify surfaces areas in view of mapping techniques used</p>	<p>Dead mats are natural components intrinsic to some types of seagrasses (e.g. striped meadows) & do not reflect systematically a regression of seagrasses in response to anthropogenic pressures. (Boudouresque <i>et al.</i>, 2006)</p>
	All	<p>Easy-to-measure & inexpensive parameter. Possible to measure length of adult leaves type 1 or 2 (most external leaves) in situ & this avoids destruction of plant. ; Lopez Y Royo <i>et al.</i>, 2010b)</p>	<p>Strong seasonal variability. Strong individual variability so necessary to measure an adequate number of bundles.</p>

Tab. 7 : Synthesis of main descriptors (1) used for monitoring marine magnoliophytes – next.

1 - Descriptor	2 - Measuring method	3 - Expected response/ factors of degradation	4 - Destruc charact
Necrosis on leaves (in %)	Percentage of leaves with necrosis, through observation in lab. (Romero <i>et al.</i> , 2007)	Augmentation More contaminants	Yes
State of apex	Percentage of leaves with broken apex	Augmentation / overgrazing	No
Foliar production (in mg dry weight. bundle. ⁻¹ , .yr ⁻¹)	With Po: possibility, thanks to lepidochronology, to ascertain number of leaves produced in a year, at present or in the past. (Pergent, 1990). Other species, measuring leaves through markings or by using the relationship length/foliar growth of bases/ (Zm; Gaeckle <i>et al.</i> , 2006).	Diminution en nutrients deficit, increase in interspecific competition	Yes & No (Zm)
Production of rhizomes (in mg dry weight. bundle. ⁻¹ , .yr ⁻¹)	With Po: possibility, thanks to lepidochronology, to ascertain rate of growth or biomass per year.	Augmentation Accumulation of sediments due to littoral developments	Yes
Recession or burying of rhizomes	Measuring degree of recession or burying of rhizomes measured (value in mm) or percentage of buried or receded bundles on a given surface area	Augmentation in burying Accumulation of sediments due to littoral developments urban effluent discharge ,presence of marine farms and dredging rejects, Recession increase Deficit in sediments due to littoral developments	No
Epiphytes of leaves (in mg dry weight bundle. ⁻¹ or % dry weight bundle. ⁻¹).	Several measurements possible : evaluation of biomass (μg bundle. ⁻¹ , after scraping, drying & weighing), of nitrogen content (in % dry weight ; measure using simple analyser CHN ; Romero <i>et al.</i> , 2007)	Augmentation / Increase in nutrients contribution of rivers, (Fernandez-Torquemada <i>et al.</i> , 2008)	Yes

	5 - Target species	6 – Interest	7 - Limits
	Po	Easy-to-measure & inexpensive parameter	Necrosis very rare in some sectors of the Mediterranean (e.g. Corsica littoral)
	Po	Easy-to-measure & inexpensive parameter.	Of little use in case of strong hydrodynamism & on old leaves
	All	For Po lepidochronology makes it possible to work over whole bathymetric tranche & interpretation scale is available (Pergent <i>et al.</i> , 2008). For Zm the relationship length of bases & foliar growth makes it possible to have in situ non destructive measuring.	For other species parameter takes long to acquire & necessitates monthly monitoring or at least for 4 seasons. (Gaeckle <i>et al.</i> , 2006).
	Po	Parameter independent of season	Interpretation sometimes difficult as rhizome production increase can be observed in reference sites in the absence of anthropogenic impact.
	All	Recession or burying easy to measure in situ, non destructive & inexpensive Parameter independent of the season	
	All	Easy-to-measure & inexpensive parameter (biomass). Interpretation scale available (Morri, 1991 in Pergent-Martini <i>et al.</i> , 2005)	Parameters with strong seasonal & spatial variations. Parameters necessitating specific analytical equipment (nitrogen content)

Tab. 7 : Synthesis of main descriptors (1) used for monitoring marine magnoliophytes – next.

1 - Descriptor	2 - Measuring method	3 - Expected response/ factors of degradation	4 - Destruc charact
Physiological or cellular information			
Nitrogen & phosphorus content of plant plant plant phosphorus (in % dry weight)	Dosage through mass spectrometry & plasma torch in different plant tissue after acid mineralisation (e.g. rhizomes of Po ; Romero <i>et al.</i> , 2007)	Augmentation Nutrient increase	Yes
carbohydrates content (in % dry weight)	Dosage through spectrophotometry after alcohol extraction in different plant tissues (e.g. rhizomes of Po ; Alcoverro <i>et al.</i> , 1999, 2001b in Romero <i>et al.</i> , 2007)	Diminution anthropogenic Impact	Yes
Trace metal content (in $\mu\text{g.g}^{-1}$)	Dosage through spectrometry in different plant tissues after acid minéralisation (Salivas-Decaux, 2009).	Augmentation More metallic contaminants	Yes
Nitrogen isotopic relationship (d^{15}N in ‰)	Dosage through mass spectrometer in different plant tissues after acid mineralisation (e.g. rhizomes of Po ; Romero <i>et al.</i> , 2007)	Augmentation Increase in nutrients from marine farms & urban effluents Diminution Increase in nutriments from fertilizers	Yes
Sulphur isotopic relationship (d^{34}S in ‰)	Dosage through mass spectrometer in different plant tissues (e.g. rhizomes of Po ; Romero <i>et al.</i> , 2007)	Diminution anthropogenic Impact	Yes

5 - Target species	6 - Interest	7 - Limits
All	Short response time to environmental changes	Very expensive parameter, necessitating analytical equipment & specific competence
All	Short response time to environmental changes	Expensive parameter necessitating analytical equipment and specific competence
All	Short response time to environmental changes	Expensive parameter necessitating analytical equipment & specific competence
Po	Short response time to environmental changes	Very expensive parameter necessitating analytical equipment & specific competence
Po	Short response time to environmental changes	Very expensive parameter necessitating analytical equipment & specific competence

b) What monitoring system?

Setting up a monitoring system means starting with the data acquisition phase. The observations and sampling during the acquisition phases or data validations of the cartographical surveys, could also constitute the outline of a monitoring system (Kenny *et al.*, 2003) even if it is not just limited to that and cartography could also constitute a monitoring tool (Tab. 7; Boudouresque *et al.*, 2006).

On a regional geographical level today there are two main types of monitoring systems: the marine magnoliophyta monitoring system (SeagrassNet) which was established on a worldwide level at the beginning of the year 2000 and which covers all the species of marine magnoliophytes (Short *et al.* 2002 and the "Posidonia" monitoring network initiated in the Mediterranean at the beginning of the 1980s (Boudouresque *et al.*, 2006) and which is specific to the *Posidonia oceanica* species but which can be adapted to other Mediterranean species and to the genus *Posidonia* in general. The Posidonia monitoring system is used today, with a degree of variability from one country to another and even from one region to another within the same State (Buia *et al.*, 2004; Boudouresque *et al.*, 2006, Romero *et al.* 2007; Fernandez-Torquemada *et al.*, 2008; Lopez y Royo, 2010a) in at least nine Mediterranean countries and in over 350 sites. After the work carried out within the framework of the Interreg IIIB MEDOCC programme "coherence, development, harmonization and validation of evaluation methods of the quality of the littoral environment by monitoring the *Posidonia oceanica* meadows, and the "MedPosidonia" programme set up by RAC/SPA, an updated and standardized approach for the P. monitoring network has been tested and validated (UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA). The main differences between these two great systems are:

- ◆ Within the framework of SeagrassNet, monitoring is done along the three permanent transects, parallel to the coast and positioned respectively (i) in the most superficial part of the meadow, (ii) in the deepest part and (iii) at an intermediate depth between these two positions. The descriptors chosen (Short *et al.*, 2002; Tab.8) are measured on precise and fixed points along each of the transects every three months.
- ◆ Within the framework of the "Posidonia" monitoring system, the measurements are taken (i) at the fixed markers placed along the lower limit of the meadow, (ii) at a portion of the upper limit and (iii) at an intermediate fixed depth of -15 m. The descriptors (Tab. 8) are measured only every three years if after visual control there are no changes in the geographical position of the limits.

If the SeagrassNet makes it possible to compare the data obtained in the Mediterranean with the data obtained in other regions of the world, as it has a world coverage of over 80 sites distributed in 26 countries (www.seagrassnet.org), it is not that suitable for large-size species (*Posidonia* genus) and for meadows whose lower limit is beyond 25 m depth and which was set up only for one site in the Mediterranean (Pergent *et al.*, 2007).

The descriptors measured basically provide information on the state of health of the meadow concerned. The "Posidonia" monitoring system, in view of the multiplicity of descriptors identified (Tab. 7), makes it possible to compare the different meadows in the Mediterranean and also to evaluate the plant's vitality and the quality of the environment in which it grows (so that the plant is then used as a global bio-indicator). Monitoring also becomes less of a constraint as the observations can be spaced out over a period of time.



Tab. 8 : Nature of parameters measured within the framework of the SeagrassNet, Corsica P. Monitoring Network (RSP Corse) (Pergent *et al.*, 2007) and the MedPosidonia programme (Pergent *et al.*, 2009).

Paramètres	SeagrassNet	RSP	MedPosidonia
Light	X	-	-
Temperature	X	-	X
Salinity	X	-	-
Lower limit	Depth	depth, type and cartography	depth, type, cartography
Upper limite	Profondeur	depth, type and cartography	Cartography
Density	12 measurement along transect	Measurement at each of 11 markers	Measurement at each of 11 markers
% plagiotropic rhizomes	-	Measurement at each of 11 markers	Measurement at each of 11 markers
Receding	-	Measurement at each of 11 markers	Measurement at each of 11 markers
Cover	12 mesures along transect	Along markers using (50m) vidéo	Measurement along each of 11 markers
Phenological analysis	12 mesures along transect	on 20 bundles	on 20 bundles
lépidochronological analysis	-	on 10 bundles	on 10 bundles
State of apex	-	On 20 bundles	on 20 bundles
Biomass (g. poids sec)	Feuilles	-	-
Necromass	Rhizome & scales	-	-
Granulometry of sédiment	-	1 measurement	1 measurement
% organic material of sédiment	-	1 measurement	1 measurement
Trace-metal content	-	-	Ag & Hg



© RAC/SPA, Mathieu FOULQUIE

Other, intermediate techniques between these two methods (permanent transects with seasonal monitoring, acoustic data) can be used in particular situations like the monitoring of lagoon environments (Pasqualini *et al.*, 2006) or for the study of “relic” meadows (Descamp *et al.*, 2009).

It needs to be stressed that:

- ◆ In addition to the chosen technique, the measured parameters (Tab. 7 & 8) determine the nature of the monitoring (e.g. monitoring of chemical contamination of the environment, discharge into the sea from a treatment plant, general evaluation of a meadow’s state of health);
- ◆ No matter what parameters are chosen, particular attention must be paid to the validity of the measurements made (acquisition protocol, precision of the measurements, reproducibility, whether parameters correspond to expected monitoring data; Lopez Y Royo *et al.*, 2010a).

c) How to interpret monitoring data?

Monitoring data can be interpreted on the basis of what experts say or by comparing the measured data with the data available in the literature, either directly or through scales. The multiplication of studies on *Posidonia oceanica* (over 1000 publications indexed in the Web of Science) means that in the last few decades a growing number of interpretation scales have been set up of the most widely used parameters for monitoring this species (e.g. Giraud, 1977; Meinesz & Laurent, 1978; Pergent *et al.*, 1995b;

Pergent-Martini *et al.*, 1999; Montefalcone *et al.*, 2006; Salivas-Decaux *et al.*, in press; Tab. 7).

The implementation of the Water Framework Directive in the European countries has led to:

- ◆ An adaptation of some of the scales (rating), (e.g. density in Pergent-Martini *et al.*, 1999) with the creation of five classes (bad, poor, moderate, good and high: Annex 3);
- ◆ The setting up of synthetic indices to provide, on the basis of a panel of different parameters, (Buia *et al.*, 2004, Pergent *et al.* 2007, Romero *et al.*, 2007, Fernandez-Torquemada *et al.*, 2008, Gobert *et al.*, 2009, Lopez Y Royo *et al.*, 2009, Montefalcone 2009) a global evaluation of the quality of the water masses based on the “marine magnoliophyta” biological quality factor. This panel or range must be based on an adequate number of parameters to avoid evaluation errors but not too many to avoid excessive costs in terms of acquisition time and the budget required. (Fernandez-Torquemada *et al.*, 2008).

In the present state of knowledge it is difficult to opt for one or other of these synthetic indices as it has not been possible to compare them all on one single site.

Intercalibration trials between the POMI (Romero *et al.*, 2007) and POSID indices (Pergent *et al.*, 2008) have shown that there is a coherence in the classification order of the five sites studied (the Corsican sites had a higher classification than the

Catalonia sites). Applying the BIPO index to 9 Mediterranean sites yields an identical classification of the Catalonia sites like the classification obtained with the POMI index (Lopez Y Royo *et al.*, 2010c). Finally, using both the POSID and BIPO indices within the framework of the “MedPosidonia” programme also yielded a similar classification of the meadows studied (Pergent *et al.*, 2009).

The POMI (Romero *et al.*, 2007) and POSID (Pergent *et al.*, 2007) indices are of interest as they are based on several parameters (respectively 14 and 8) which include different levels of

organisation (of the population on a cellular level) and therefore response times which can be quite rapid and which yield information on the meadow and the mats, the plant structure and the impact of human activities through an increase in nutrients and the accumulation of trace-metals.

The BIPO index is based only on non-destructive parameters (Lopez Y Royo *et al.*, 2010b) and is particularly well suited for the monitoring of species or protected areas.



| © Unidad de Biología Marina, University of Alicante (Spain)

CONCLUSION

The approaches proposed for mapping and for monitoring marine magnoliophyta meadows are therefore similar (Fig. 14 & 15) and can be divided into three stages:

- ◆ Planning
- ◆ Implementation and data acquisition
- ◆ Analysis, data interpretation and archiving

STEPS TO BE TAKEN FOR MAPPING MARINE MAGNOLIOPHYTA MEADOWS

Initial Planning

- ◆ Definition of mapping objectives (e.g. heritage inventory, impact study, knowledge, monitoring over a period of time)
- ◆ Determination of surface area to be mapped and the necessary precision
- ◆ Identification of tools to be used and the survey strategy
- ◆ Evaluation of requirements (necessary means such as human, material and financial resources)

Survey data per se

- ◆ Acquisition of the necessary data with complementary tools: optical methods and/ or random observation for the superficial tranche (0 to -15 m), acoustic methods and/ or random observations for the lower tranche (beyond -15 m).
- ◆ Validation of acquired data with geo-located in situ observations which are numerous enough and distributed appropriately (e.g. with the necessary precision, heterogeneity of habitats).
- ◆ Accurate archiving of data (what data, why, by whom, how and where?)

Data processing and interpretation

- ◆ Data processing and classification (e.g. reference list of Mediterranean marine habitats)
- ◆ Data interpretation (e.g. direct interpretation, according to what the experts say, or statistical modeling on the basis of available observations).
- ◆ Preparation of map using standardized representations.
- ◆ Evaluation of reliability of results (e.g. quality of the bibliographical data used, suitable surveying techniques, % of the surface area really inventoried in relationship to the mapped area, precision of positioning, heterogeneity of habitat...).

Fig. 14 : Synthesis of the approach proposed for cartography

STEPS TO BE TAKEN FOR SETTING UP A MONITORING SYSTEM FOR MARINE MAGNOLIOPHYTA MEADOWS

Initial planning

- ◆ Definition of monitoring objectives (e.g. control within the framework of developments in the environment, monitoring for regulatory purposes, monitoring over a period of time of trends for heritage and conservation reasons).
- ◆ Locating sites to be monitored
- ◆ Identifying parameters to be taken into account by targeting different levels of organization (e.g. population, individual, and cell) and setting up a sampling strategy.
- ◆ Evaluation of requirements (necessary human, material and financial resources).

Setting up the monitoring system

- ◆ Positioning of structures to ensure monitoring over time (e.g. fixed markers, buoys, transects...).
- ◆ Acquisition of parameters chosen at the initial phase and establishing a reference report or initial report for each of the monitored sites.
- ◆ Regular return visits to the sites in line with the monitoring strategy and enhance the chosen parameters.

Data processing and interpretation

- ◆ Measurements made in situ to be analyzed and archived
- ◆ Data interpretation (.e.g. according to the experts, direct interpretation through comparison with data from the literature or through the interpretation grids or existing indices).
- ◆ Checking that the results obtained respond to the monitoring objectives (reliability and reproducibility of the results, valid interpretations and coherence with the observations made).

Fig. 15 : Synthesis of approach proposed for monitoring

There are no ideal methods for mapping or universal parameters for the monitoring of marine magnoliophyta meadows but rather a great diversity of efficient and complementary tools. They must be chosen depending on the objectives in mind and the species present and the local context.

As for cartography, an integration into a Geo-referenced Information System which can be freely consulted (like MedGIS implemented by RAC/SPA), is to be recommended and should be encouraged, so that the data acquired becomes available to the wider public and can be of benefit to the maximum number of users.

As for effective monitoring, this should be done over a period of time even if it means limiting the number of sites being monitored and the number of parameters. The parameters should be adequate enough to avoid errors of interpretation but sufficiently reduced in numbers to ensure permanent monitoring. The nature of the parameter is less important than reproducibility, reliability and the precision of the method used for its acquisition.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barsanti M., Delbono I., Ferretti O., Peirano A., Bianchi C.N., Morri C., 2007. Measuring change of Mediterranean coastal biodiversity: diachronic mapping of the meadow of the seagrass *Cymodocea nodosa* (Ucria) Ascherson in the Gulf of Tigullio (Ligurian Sea, NW Mediterranean). *Hydrobiologia*, 580 : 35-41
- Bellan-Santini D., Bellan G., Bitar G., Harmelin J.G., Pergent G., 2002. Handbook for interpreting types of marine habitat for the selection of sites to be included in the national inventories of natural sites of conservation interest. *RAC/SPA edit., UNEP publ.* : 217p.
- Boudouresque C.F., Charbonnel E., Coppo S., Le Direach L., Ruitton S., 2006. Les méthodes de surveillance des herbiers à *Posidonia oceanica*. In « Préservation et conservation des herbiers à *Posidonia oceanica* », Boudouresque C.F., Bernard G., Bonhomme P., Charbonnel E., Diviacco G., Meinesz A., Pergent G., Pergent-Martini C., Ruitton S., Tunesi L. eds., *RAMOGE Publ.*, Monaco : 132-140.
- Boudouresque C.F., Charbonnel E., Meinesz A., Pergent G., Pergent-Martini C., Cadiou G., Bertrand M.C., Foret P., Ragazzi M., Rico-Raimondino V., 2000. A monitoring network based on the seagrass *Posidonia oceanica* in the northwestern Mediterranean Sea. *Biol. mar. medit.*, 7(2) : 328-331.
- Boudouresque C.F., Meinesz A., 1982. Découverte de l'herbier de Posidonie. *Cah. Parc nation. Port-Cros*, 4: 1-79.
- Buia M.C., Gambi M.C., Dappiano M., 2004. Seagrass systems. In: Gambi M.C., Dappiano M. eds. *Mediterranean marine benthos: a manual of methods for its sampling and study*. *Biol. mar. Medit.* 11(suppl. 1): 133-183.
- Cerdeira-Estrada S., Lorenzo-Sanchez S., Areces-Mallea A., Martinez-Bayon C., 2008. Mapping of the spatial distribution of benthic habitats in the Gulf of Batabano using Landsat-7 images. *Ciencias Marinas*, 34(2) : 213-222.
- Ciraolo G., Cox E., La Loggia G., Maltese A., 2006. The classification of submerged vegetation using hyperspectral MIVIS data. *Annals of Geophysics*, 49(1) : 287-294.
- Clabaut P., Augris C., Morvan L., Pasqualini V., Pergent G., Pergent-Martini C., 2006. Les fonds marins de Corse. Cartographie bio-morpho-sédimentaire par sonar à balayage latéral - Atlas de sonogrammes. *Rapport Ifremer & Univ. Corse*, N°GM 06-01 : 78 p.
- Costanza R., d'Arge R., de Groot R., Farber S., Grasso M., Hannon B., Limburg K., Naem S., O'Neill R.V., Paruelo J., Raskin R.G., Sutton P., van der Belt M., 1997. The value of the World's ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature*, 387 : 253-260.
- Dekker A., Brando V., Anstee J., 2006. Remote sensing of seagrass ecosystems : Use of spaceborne and airborne sensors. In "Seagrasses: biology, ecology and conservation" Larkum A.W.D., Orth R.J. and Duarte C.M. Eds., *Springer Publ., Dordrecht* : 347-35.
- Delgado O., Ruiz J., Pérez M., Romero J., Ballesteros E., 1999. Effects of fish farming on seagrass (*Posidonia oceanica*) in a Mediterranean bay: seagrass decline after organic loading cessation. *Oceanol. Acta*, 22(1) : 109-117.
- Denis J., Hervé G., Deneux F., Sauzade D., Bonhomme P., Bernard G., Boudouresque C.F., Leriche A., Charbonnel E., Le Direac'h L., 2003. Guide méthodologique pour la cartographie des biocénoses marines. Volet N°1 : l'herbier à *Posidonia oceanica*. Guide méthodologique. Agence de l'Eau, Région Provence Alpes-Côte d'Azur et DIREN PACA. IFREMER, GIS Posidonie & Centre d'Océanologie de Marseille, *GIS Posidonie publ.* : 1-93.
- Descamp P., Holon F., Ballesta L., 2009. Microcartographie par télémétrie acoustique de 9 herbiers de posidonie pour le suivi de la qualité des masses d'eau côtières méditerranéennes françaises dans le cadre de la DCE. Contrat L'OEil Andromède/ Agence de l'Eau, CRLR, CRPACA. *Andromède publ.*, Montpellier :1-59pp. + annexes.
- Descamp P., Pergent G., Ballesta L., Foulquié M., 2005. Underwater acoustic positioning systems as tool for *Posidonia oceanica* beds survey. *C.R. Biologies*, 328 : 75-80.
- Diaz R.J., Solan M., Valente R.M., 2004 . A review of approaches for classifying benthic habitats and evaluating habitat quality. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 73 : 165-181.
- Duarte C.M., Kirkman H., 2001. Methods for the measurement of seagrass abundance and depth distribution. In "Global Seagrass Research Methods", F.T. Short & R.G. Coles eds, *Elsevier publ.*, Amsterdam : 141-153.
- EEC, 1992. Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. *Official Journal of the European Communities*. No L 206 of 22 July 1992.
- Fernandez-Torquemada Y., Diaz-Valdes M., Colilla F., Luna B., Sanchez-Lizaso J.L., Ramos-Espla A.A., 2008. Descriptors from *Posidonia oceanica* (L.) Delile meadows in coastal waters of Valencia, Spain, in the context of the EU Water Framework Directive. *Ices Journal of Marine Science*, 65(8) : 1492-1497.
- Foden J., Brazier D.P., 2007. Angiosperms (seagrass) within the EU water framework directive: A UK perspective. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 55 (1-6) : 181-195.
- Frederiksen M., Krause-Jensen D., Holmer M., Laursen J.S., 2004. Longterm changes in area distribution of eelgrass (*Zostera marina*) in Danish coastal waters. *Aquatic Botany*, 78 : 167-181.
- Gaeckle J.L., Short F.T., Ibarra-Obando S.E., Meling-Lopez A.E., 2006. Sheath length as a monitoring tool for calculating leaf growth in eelgrass (*Zostera marina* L.). *Aquatic Botany*, 84(3) : 226-232.
- Gagnon P., Scheibling R. E., Jones W., Tully D., 2008. The role of digital bathymetry in mapping shallow marine vegetation from hyperspectral image data. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 29(3) : 879-904.
- Giraud G., 1977. Essai de classement des herbiers de *Posidonia oceanica* (Linné) Delile. *Bot. Mar.*, 20 (8) : 487-491.
- Giraud G., 1979. Sur une méthode de mesure et de comptage des structures foliaires de *Posidonia oceanica* (Linnaeus) Delile. *Bull. Mus. Hist. nat. Marseille*, 39: 33-39.
- Gobert S., Sartoretto S., Rico-Raimondino V., Andral B., Chery A., Lejeune P., Boissery P., 2009. Assessment of the ecological status of Mediterranean French coastal waters as required by the Water Framework Directive using the *Posidonia oceanica* Rapid Easy Index: PREI. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*.

- Godet L., Fournier J., Toupoint N., Olivier F., 2009. Mapping and monitoring intertidal benthic habitats: a review of techniques and a proposal for a new visual methodology for the European coasts. *Progress in Physical Geography*, 33(3) : 378-402.
- Green E., Short F., 2003. World Atlas of Seagrass.
- Kenny A.J., Cato I., Desprez M., Fader G., Schuttenhelm R.T.E., Side J., 2003. An overview of seabed-mapping technologies in the context of marine habitat classification. *Ices Journal of Marine Science*, 60(2) : 411-418.
- Komatsu T., Igarashi C., Tatsukawa K., Sultana S., Matsuoka Y., Harada S., 2003. Use of multi-beam sonar to map seagrass beds in Otsuchi Bay on the Sanriku Coast of Japan. *Aquatic Living Resources*, 16(3) : 223-230.
- Lopez y Royo C., Casazza G., Pergent-Martini C., Pergent G., 2010b. A biotic index using the seagrass *Posidonia oceanica* (BiPo), to evaluate ecological status of coastal waters. *Ecological Indicators*, 10(2) : 380-389.
- Lopez y Royo C., Pergent G., Alcoverro T., Buia M.C., Casazza G., Martínez-Crego B., Pérez M., Silvestre F., Romero J., 2010c. The seagrass *Posidonia oceanica* as indicator of coastal water quality: Experimental intercalibration of classification systems. *Ecological indicators*.
- Lopez y Royo C., Pergent G., Pergent-Martini C., Casazza G., 2010a. Seagrass (*Posidonia oceanica*) monitoring in western Mediterranean: implications for management and conservation. *Environ Monit Assess.*, 171:365-380.
- Lopez y Royo C., Silvestri C., Salivas-Decaux M., Pergent G., Casazza G., 2009. Application of an angiosperm-based classification system (BiPo) to Mediterranean coastal waters: using spatial analysis and data on metal contamination of plants in identifying sources of pressure. *Hydrobiologia*.
- McKenzie L.J., Finkbeiner M.A., Kirkman H., 2001. Methods for mapping sea grass distribution. In : "Global Seagrass Research Methods" Short F.T. and Coles R.G. Eds., Elsevier Scientific Publishers B.V., Amsterdam : 101-122.
- Meinesz A., Laurent R., 1978. Cartographie et état de la limite inférieure de l'herbier de *Posidonia oceanica* dans les Alpes-maritimes (France). Campagne Poséidon 1976. *Botanica marina*, 21 (8) : 513-526.
- Montefalcone M., 2009. Ecosystem health assessment using the Mediterranean seagrass *Posidonia oceanica*: A review. *Ecological Indicators*, 9: 595-604
- Montefalcone M., Bianchi C.N., Morri C., Peirano A., Albertelli G., 2006. Lower limit typology and functioning of six *Posidonia oceanica* meadows in the Ligurian sea (nw Mediterranean). In "Proceedings of the Mediterranean Seagrass Workshop 2006 », M.C. Gambi, J.A. Borg, M.C. Buia, G. Di Carlo, C. Pergent-Martini, G. Pergent, G. Procaccini eds. *Biologia Marina Mediterranea*, 13 (4) : 262-266.
- Mumby P.J., Edwards A.J., 2002. Mapping marine environments with IKONOS imagery: enhanced spatial resolution can deliver greater thematic accuracy. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 82(2-3) : 248-257.
- Mumby P.J., Green E.P., Edwards A.J., Clark C.D., 1999. The cost-effectiveness of remote sensing for tropical coastal resources assessment and management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 55 : 157-166.
- Orfanidis S., Papathanasiou V., Gounaris S., Theodosiou Th., 2010. Size distribution approaches for monitoring and conservation of coastal Cymodocea habitats. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 20(2) : 177-188.
- Paillard M., Gravez V., Clabaut P., Walker P., Blanc J., Boudouresque C.F., Belsher T., Ursheler F., Poydenot F., Sinnassamy J., Augris C., Peyronnet J., Kessler M., Augustin J., Le Drezen E., Prudhomme C., Raillard J., Pergent G., Hoareau A., Charbonnel E., 1993. Cartographie de l'herbier de Posidonie et des fonds marins environnants de Toulon à Hyères (Var - France). Reconnaissance par sonar latéral et photographie aérienne. Notice de présentation. *Ifremer & Gis Posidonie Publ.* : 1-36.
- Pasqualini V., 1997. Caractérisation des peuplements et types de fonds le long du littoral corse (Méditerranée, France). Thèse Doctorat « Ecologie marine », Université de Corse : 1-172.
- Pasqualini V., Pergent-Martini C., Fernandez C., Pergent G., 1997. The use of aerial teledetection for benthic cartography : Advantages and reliability. *International Journal Remote Sensing*, 18 (5) : 1167-1177.
- Pasqualini V., Pergent-Martini C., Clabaut P., Pergent G., 1998. Mapping of *Posidonia oceanica* using aerial photographs and side-scan sonar : Application of the island of Corsica (France). *Estuarine Coastal Shelf Science*, 47 : 359-367.
- Pasqualini V., Pergent-Martini C., Fernandez C., Ferrat L., Tomaszewski J.E., Pergent G., 2006. Wetland monitoring : Aquatic plant changes in two Corsican coastal lagoons (Western Mediterranean Sea). *Aquatic Conservation*, 16(1) : 43-60.
- Pasqualini V., Pergent-Martini C., Pergent G., 1999. Environmental impacts identification along the Corsican coast (Mediterranean sea) using image processing. *Aquatic Botany*, 65 : 311-320.
- Pasqualini V., Pergent-Martini C., Pergent G., Agreil M., Skoufas G., Sourbes L., Tsirika A., 2005. Use of SPOT 5 for mapping seagrasses : an application to *Posidonia oceanica*. *Remote Sensing Environment*, 94 : 39-45.
- Pergent G., 1990. Lepidochronological analysis of the seagrass *Posidonia oceanica* (L.) Delile: a standardized approach. *Aquat. Bot.* 37: 39-54.
- Pergent G., 2006 . Le rôle des herbiers à *Posidonia oceanica*. In « Préservation et conservation des herbiers à *Posidonia oceanica* », Boudouresque C.F., Bernard G., Bonhomme P., Charbonnel E., Diviacco G., Meinesz A., Pergent G., Pergent-Martini C., Ruitton S., Tunesi L. eds., RAMOGE Publ., Monaco : 25-31.
- Pergent G., 2007. Protocole pour la mise en place d'une surveillance des herbiers de Posidonies. Programme « MedPosidonia » / CAR/ASP - Fondation d'entreprise TOTAL pour la Biodiversité et la Mer ; Mémoire d'Accord N°21/2007/RAC/SPA/ MedPosidonia Nautilus-Okianos: 24p + Annexes.
- Pergent G., Chessa L., Cossu A., Gazale V., Pasqualini V., Pergent-Martini C., 1995a. Aménagement du littoral : Apport de la cartographie benthique. *Res Mediterranea*, 2 : 45-57.
- Pergent G., Leonardini R., Lopez Y Royo C., Mimault B., Pergent-Martini C., 2008. Mise en œuvre d'un Réseau de Surveillance Posidonies le long du littoral de la Corse – Rapport de synthèse 2004-2008. Contrat Office de l'Environnement de la Corse et GIS Posidonie Centre de Corse, GIS Posidonie Publ., Corte : 1 - 273.

Pergent G., Pergent-Martini C., 1995. Mise en œuvre d'un réseau de surveillance de la végétation marine en Méditerranée - Synthèse. Contrat RACSPA N°10/94 : 1-25 + 10p. Annexes.

Pergent G., Pergent-Martini C., Boudouresque C.F., 1995b. Utilisation de l'herbier à *Posidonia oceanica* comme indicateur biologique de la qualité du milieu littoral en Méditerranée : Etat des connaissances. *Mésogée*, 54 : 3-29.

Pergent G., Pergent-Martini C., Casalta B., Lopez y Royo C., Mimault B., Salivas-Decaux M., Short F., 2007. Comparison of three seagrass monitoring systems: SeagrassNet, «Posidonia» programme and RSP. Proceedings of the third Mediterranean symposium on marine vegetation (Marseille, 27-29 March 2007). C. Pergent-Martini, S. El Asmi, C. Le Ravallec eds., *RAC/SPA publ.*, Tunis: 141-150.

Pergent-Martini C., Leoni V., Pasqualini V., Ardizzone G.D., Balestri E., Bedini R., Belluscio A., Belsher T., Borg J., Boudouresque C.F., Boumaza S., Bouquegneau J.M., Buia M.C., Calvo S., Cebrian J., Charbonnel E., Cinelli F., Cossu A., Di Maida G., Dural B., Francour P., Gobert S., Lepoint G., Meinesz A., Molenaar H., Mansour H.M., Panayotidis P., Peirano A., Pergent G., Piazzi L., Pirrotta M., Relini G., Romero J., Sanchez-Lizaso J.L., Semroud R., Shembri P., Shili A., Tomasello A., Velimirov B., 2005. Descriptors of *Posidonia oceanica* meadows: use and application. *Ecological Indicators*, 5: 213-230.

Pergent-Martini C., Pergent G., Fernandez C., Ferrat L., 1999. Value and use of *Posidonia oceanica* as a biological indicator. In proceed. MEDCOAST 99 - EMECS 99 Joint Conference « Land-ocean interactions : managing coastal ecosystems », MEDCOAST, Middle East Technical Univ. Publ, Ankara, 1 : 73-90.

Phinn S., Roelfsema C., Dekker A., Brando V., Anstee J., 2008. Mapping seagrass species, cover and biomass in shallow waters: An assessment of satellite multi-spectral and airborne hyper-spectral imaging systems in Moreton Bay (Australia). *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 112(8) : 3413-3425.

PNUE-PAM, 2009. Rapport de la Seizième réunion ordinaire des Parties contractantes à la Convention sur la protection du milieu marin et du littoral de la Méditerranée et à ses Protocoles. Document de travail, Marrakech - Maroc, 3 – 5 novembre 2009, *PAM Publ.*, UNEP(DEPI)/MED IG.19/8 : 1-22 + ann.

PNUE-PAM-CAR/ASP, 1999. Plan d'action relatif à la conservation de la végétation marine de Méditerranée. *CAR/ASP Publ.*, Tunis : 1-47.

PNUE-PAM-CAR/ASP, 2005. Rapport d'évaluation de la mise en œuvre du plan d'action pour la conservation de la végétation marine en mer Méditerranée. Document de travail pour la septième réunion des points focaux nationaux pour les ASP, Séville - Espagne, 31 Mai – 3 juin 2005, *CAR/ASP Publ.*, UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.268/6 : 1-51 + Ann.

PNUE-PAM-CAR/ASP, 2007. Rapport sur l'Etat d'Avancement des Activités du CAR/ASP. Document de travail pour la huitième réunion des points focaux nationaux pour les ASP, Palerme - Italie, 6-9 juin 2007, *CAR/ASP Publ.*, UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.308/4 Rev.1 : 1-29.

PNUE-PAM-CAR/ASP, 2009a. Etat des connaissances relatif à la répartition des herbiers de magnoliophytes marines en Méditerranée. Leonardini R., Pergent G., Boudouresque C.F. eds. Document d'information pour la neuvième réunion des points focaux nationaux pour les ASP, Floriana – Malte, 3 – 6 juin 2009, *CAR/ASP Publ.*, UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.331/Inf.5: 1-376.

PNUE-PAM-CAR/ASP, 2009b. Rapport sur le projet MedPosidonia. Rais C., Pergent G., Dupuy de la Grandrive R., Djellouli A. eds. Document d'information pour la neuvième réunion des points focaux nationaux pour les ASP, Floriana – Malte, 3 – 6 juin 2009, *CAR/ASP Publ.*, UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.331/Inf.11: 1-107 + ann.

PNUE-PAM-Plan Bleu, 2009. Etat de l'environnement et du développement en Méditerranée. *PNUE/PAM-Plan Bleu publ.*, Athènes : 212p.

Projet MESH, 2008. Guide de cartographie des habitats marins. RST - DYNECO/AG/07-21/JP – *Ifremer*, Centre de Brest : 74p.

Projet POSIDONIA, 2007. Rapport final d'activité du groupe de travail « Cartographie ». Programme Interreg IIIB MEDOCC « Mise en cohérence, développement, harmonisation et validation de méthodes d'évaluation de la qualité du milieu littoral par le suivi de l'herbier de *Posidonia oceanica*. *Ifremer*, ARPAL, ENEA, GIS Posidonie, Osservatorio Ligura, BMC Studio & P. Clabaut Consultant edit., 1- 68 + Ann.

Richir J., Salivas-Decaux M., Lafabrie C., Lopez y Royo C., Gobert S., Pergent G., Pergent-Martini C., 2015. Bioassessment of trace element contamination of Mediterranean coastal waters using the seagrass *Posidonia oceanica*, *Journal of Environmental Management*, 150: 1-14.

Riegl B.M., Purkis S.J., 2005. Detection of shallow subtidal corals from IKONOS satellite and QTC View (50, 200 kHz) single-beam sonar data (Arabian Gulf; Dubai, UAE). *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 95(1) : 96-114.

Romero J., Martinez-Crego B., Alcoverro T., Pérez M., 2007. A multivariate index based on the seagrass *Posidonia oceanica* (POMI) to assess ecological status of coastal waters under the water framework directive (WFD). *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 55 : 196-204.

Salivas-Decaux M., 2009. Caractérisation et valorisation des herbiers à *Posidonia oceanica* (L.) Delile et à *Cymodocea nodosa* (Ucria) Ascherson dans le bassin méditerranéen. Thèse Doctorat «Ecologie marine », Université de Corse : 1-168.

Salivas-Decaux M., Alglave C., Leonardini R., Mimault B., Pergent G., 2008. Cartographie des principaux peuplements et types de fonds de la baie de Girolata - Projet d'installation des mouillages organisés. Contrat GIS Posidonie et Municipalité d'Osani : 1-22.

Salivas-Decaux M., Bonacorsi M., Pergent G., Pergent-Martini C., in press. Evaluation of the contamination of the mediterranean sea based on the accumulation of trace-metals by *Posidonia oceanica*. Proceedings of the fourth Mediterranean symposium on marine vegetation (Hammamet, 2-4 December 2010). S. El Asmi ed., *RAC/SPA publ.*, Tunis.

Short F., Coles R.G., 2001 Global Seagrass Research Methods. *Elsevier Science B.V. publ.*, Amsterdam : 1-473.

Short F., McKenzie L.J., Coles R.G., Vidler K.P., 2002. Seagrassnet – Manual for scientific monitoring of sea grass habitat. Queensland Department of Primary Industries, QFS, Cairns : 56 p.

Walker D.I., 1989. Methods for monitoring seagrass habitat. Rep. Workshop 20-22 June 1988 Melbourne, *VIMS Working paper 18* : 1-26 + Ann.

ANNEX 1 – KEYNOTE PRESENTATION AT THE ROUND TABLE, ORGANIZED BY RAC/SPA IN HVAR (SEPTEMBER 2009)

Context



3rd Mediterranean Symposium on marine végétation (Marseille 2007)

Creation of a tool-box for studying seagrasses

Proposition of guidelines for the mapping and the monitoring

Questionnaire

Mapping

- How the situation?
- Are there methods?
- For each, is it necessary to propose a standardization?
- Are they relevant for all the Mediterranean species?
- Are they applicable in each Mediterranean countries?
- Advantages and limits?

Monitoring

- How the situation is?
- Are there methods?
- For each, is it necessary to propose a standardization?
- Are they relevant for all the Mediterranean species?
- Are they applicable in each Mediterranean countries?
- Advantages and limits?

Mapping

Present situation ?



Main methods used



<http://www.ifremer.fr/posidonia/> <http://www.searchmesh.net/>

Is standardization useful or required ?

Monitoring

Present situation ?



Existing methods



Descriptors of *Posidonia oceanica* meadows: Use and application. E. Pergent-Martini & V. Leoni A., V. Pasqualini & G.D. Artizzone B., E. Balestri c, R. Bedini d, A. Bellucio b, T. Belsber e, J. Borg f, C.F. Bourneville g, S. Boumiza h, J.M. Bouquenesu i, M.C. Buis j, S. Calvo k, J. Cochran l, E. Charbonnel g, F. Cinelli c, A. Corso m, G. Di Marco k, B. Duran n, P. Francour o, S. Gobert l, G. Legoinc l, A. Meirez o, H. Mdenaar o, H.M. Mansour p, P. Panayotidis q, A. Peirani c, G. Pergent a, L. Piazza c, M. Pirrotta k, G. Reini s, J. Romero t, J.L. Sanchez-Lizaso u, R. Semroud h, P. Shembri f, A. Shili v, A. Tomasiello k, B. Valmirav w



→ Is a Mediterranean Monitoring System possible ?

ANNEX 2 – SUMMARY OF THE ROUND TABLE, ORGANIZED BY RAC/SPA IN HVAR (SEPTEMBER 2009)

« Standardization of methods for mapping and monitoring seagrasses in the Mediterranean region »

Chairs: Christine Pergent-Martini & Aslam Djellouli

Rapporteur: Cecilia Lopez y Royo

The context

The RAC/SPA is responsible at regional level of the implementation of the conservation Action Plan of the Mediterranean marine vegetation. During the 3rd Mediterranean Symposium on marine vegetation, in Marseille, in March 2007, a general request was formulated: the development of a common tool-box for monitoring seagrass.

The RAC/SPA therefore proposes to develop, together, guidelines for the development of this common toolbox to map and monitor seagrasses at Mediterranean level.

For this purpose, and in the context of this roundtable, a basic questionnaire has been prepared:

Mapping

- ◆ How the situation?
- ◆ Are there methods?
- ◆ For each, is it necessary to propose a standardization?
- ◆ Are they relevant for all the Mediterranean species?
- ◆ Are they applicable in each Mediterranean countries?
- ◆ Advantages and limits?

Monitoring

- ◆ How the situation is?
- ◆ Are there methods?
- ◆ For each, is it necessary to propose a standardization?
- ◆ Are they relevant for all the Mediterranean species?
- ◆ Are they applicable in each Mediterranean countries?
- ◆ Advantages and limits?

Discussion

Mapping

The present situation has been illustrated in Christine Pergent Martini's presentation (morning session). There is a certain coverage in N Mediterranean, however is this sufficient?

A variety of methods have been adopted to map seagrass beds, which mainly include satellite images, aerial photography, Side Scan Sonars, ROVs, field measures, etc.

Concerning standardisation of mapping methods, two research projects have approached the subject:

- ◆ An Interreg project, which compares the different mapping methods in terms of aim, cost and reliability.
- ◆ The MESH programme, which developed guidelines on the ability in Europe to map seagrass, however information on the Mediterranean is scarce.

The issue of cost of mapping entire coastlines was raised. In this context, the reduction of areas to be mapped is inevitable, however it is essential to keep in mind the importance of following a rationale in the selection of areas (i.e. reference sites vs impacted sites).

In addition, although financial limitations are an important issue, these do not prevent laboratories and research institutes to agree on a common tool-box of methods.

No additional comments were made concerning mapping methods.

Monitoring

The present situation has been illustrated in different presentations during the morning session. Operational *P. oceanica* monitoring networks result in a good coverage of the NW Mediterranean, and have been developed in certain areas of the southern and eastern Mediterranean. However there are important geographical gaps, in which it would be interesting to develop additional monitoring networks.

Methods to monitor seagrass, in particular *P. oceanica*, are numerous and varied. A published paper clearly summarises the different descriptors and methods adopted around the Mediterranean (Pergent-Martini *et al.*, 2005).

Considering this variety of methods, is it possible to develop a common toolbox of methods and to develop a Mediterranean monitoring network?

In terms of standardisation of methods to measure descriptors, two aspects have to be considered:

- ◆ The definition of a descriptor and,
- ◆ The method to measure this descriptor.

Is it necessary to adopt a unique definition of common descriptors (e.g. cover)? A single common definition for each descriptor would be in line with the Mediterranean regional approach. However it is difficult to reach given different labs' expertise and habits.

Is it necessary to standardize methods to measure descriptors? A strong request was expressed by managers, for experts to reach standardization at least for the most commonly used descriptors.

The issue of number and type of descriptors to be used in a monitoring programme was also raised. The choice of descriptors has to clearly correspond to the objectives of the monitoring programme, in terms of type of information required, timeframe, etc.

Ideally the common toolbox of methods should contain protocols for a certain number of descriptors. Therefore, all or part of this toolbox will be included in the monitoring network (in relation to its objectives).

In addition, the experimental design with which you measure these parameters is essential too. The adoption of an inadequate experimental design could lead to data interpretation errors.

Proposals

- ◆ Fred Short: to create a hierarchy of parameters. A hierarchy of parameters that can be measured by all, according to the information they provide. This would allow to request financial support step by step, as well as to report results in a visible way to managers. However, the parameters included in the hierarchy should have a clearly defined protocol.
- ◆ As a clearly defined protocol has been defined for the MedPosidonia programme, can't this protocol be used as the basis to discuss the development of the common toolbox of methods to map and monitor seagrass in the Mediterranean?

Conclusions

The protocol of the MedPosidonia programme and the SeagrassNet manual, that are available online (RAC/SPA and SeagrassNet websites) could be used to build this common tool-box.

Christine Pergent-Martini is available to discuss this protocol further with all the scientific community.

ANNEX 3 – GRIDS OF INTERPRETATION INTO FIVE CLASSES OF FEW DESCRIPTORS OF *POSIDONIA OCEANICA* MEADOW

Meadow structure

Type of lower limit (UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA, 2009b)

	High	Good	Moderate	Poor	Bad
Lower limit	Progressive	Sharp C+	Sharp C-	Sparse	Regressive

Type of limit	Main Characteristics
Progressive	Plagiotropic rhizome beyond the limit
Sharp – High cover (F+)	Sharp limit with cover above than 25%
Sharp – Poor cover (F -)	Sharp limit with cover lower than 25%
Sparse	Shoot density lower than 100 shoots/m ² , cover lower than 15%
Regressive	Dead matte beyond the limit

Depth of the lower limit (in m; UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA, 2009b)

	High	Good	Moderate	Poor	Bad
Lower limit	> 34.2	34.2 to 30.4	30.4 to 26.6	26.6 to 22.8	< 22.8

Leaf cover (in percentage; UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA, 2009b)

	High	Good	Moderate	Poor	Bad
Lower limit	> 35%	35% to 25%	25% to 15%	15% to 5%8	< 5%

Shoot density (number of shoots per m²)

Depth (m)	High	Good	Moderate	Poor	Bad
1	> 1133	1133 to 930	930 to 727	727 to 524	< 524
2	> 1067	1067 to 863	863 to 659	659 to 456	< 456
3	> 1005	1005 to 808	808 to 612	612 to 415	< 415
4	> 947	947 to 757	757 to 567	567 to 377	< 377
5	> 892	892 to 709	709 to 526	526 to 343	< 343
6	> 841	841 to 665	665 to 489	489 to 312	< 312
7	> 792	792 to 623	623 to 454	454 to 284	< 284
8	> 746	746 to 584	584 to 421	421 to 259	< 259
9	> 703	703 to 547	547 to 391	391 to 235	< 235
10	> 662	662 to 513	513 to 364	364 to 214	< 214
11	> 624	624 to 481	481 to 338	338 to 195	< 195
12	> 588	588 to 451	451 to 314	314 to 177	< 177
13	> 554	554 to 423	423 to 292	292 to 161	< 161
14	> 522	522 to 397	397 to 272	272 to 147	< 147
15	> 492	492 to 372	372 to 253	253 to 134	< 134
16	> 463	463 to 349	349 to 236	236 to 122	< 122
17	> 436	436 to 328	328 to 219	219 to 111	< 111
18	> 411	411 to 308	308 to 204	204 to 101	< 101
19	> 387	387 to 289	289 to 190	190 to 92	< 92
20	> 365	365 to 271	271 to 177	177 to 83	< 83
21	> 344	344 to 255	255 to 165	165 to 76	< 76
22	> 324	324 to 239	239 to 154	154 to 69	< 69
23	> 305	305 to 224	224 to 144	144 to 63	< 63
24	> 288	288 to 211	211 to 134	134 to 57	< 57
25	> 271	271 to 198	198 to 125	125 to 52	< 52
26	> 255	255 to 186	186 to 117	117 to 47	< 47
27	> 240	240 to 175	175 to 109	109 to 43	< 43
28	> 227	227 to 164	164 to 102	102 to 39	< 39
29	> 213	213 to 154	154 to 95	95 to 36	< 36
30	> 201	201 to 145	145 to 89	89 to 32	< 32
31	> 189	189 to 136	136 to 83	83 to 30	< 30
32	> 179	179 to 128	128 to 77	77 to 27	< 27
33	> 168	168 to 120	120 to 72	72 to 24	< 24
34	> 158	158 to 113	113 to 68	68 to 22	< 22
35	> 149	149 to 106	106 to 63	< 63	
36	> 141	141 to 100	100 to 59	< 59	
37	> 133	133 to 94	94 to 55	< 55	
38	> 125	125 to 88	88 to 52	< 52	
39	> 118	118 to 83	83 to 48	< 48	
40	> 111	111 to 78	78 to 45	< 45	

Plagiotropic rhizome (in percentage ; UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA, 2009b)

	High	Good	Moderate	Poor	Bad
Lower. limit	> 70%	70% to 30%	< 30%		

Plant Structure

Foliar surface (in cm² per shoot), between June and July (UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA, 2009b)

	High	Good	Moderate	Poor	Bad
-15 m	> 362	362 to 292	292 to 221	221 to 150	< 150

Number of leaves produced by year (UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA, 2009b)

	High	Good	Moderate	Poor	Bad
-15 m	>9.0	8.9 to 8.0	7.9 to 7.0	6.9 to 6.0	<5.9

Rhizome elongation (in mm per year; UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA, 2009b)

	High	Good	Moderate	Poor	Bad
-15 m	> 11	11 to 8	8 to 5	5 to 2	< 2

Environment eutrophication

Nitrogen concentration in adult leaves (in percentage, between June and July; UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA, 2009b)

	High	Good	Moderate	Poor	Bad
-15 m	< 1.9%	1.9% to 2.4%	2.4% to 3.0%	3.0% to 3.5%	> 3.5%

Organic matter in the sediment in percentage, fraction 0.063 mm; (UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA, 2009b)

	High	Good	Moderate	Poor	Bad
-15 m	< 2.5%	2.5% to 3.5%	3.5% to 4.6%	4.6% to 5.6%	> 5.6%

Environment contamination (Richir *et al.*, 2015.)

Argent Concentration (mg per g DW), blade of adult leaves, between June and July

	High	Good	Moderate	Poor	Bad
-15 m	<0.091	0.091 to 0.281	0.281 to 0.439	0.439 to 0.892	>0.892

Cadmium Concentration (mg per g DW), blade of adult leaves, between June and July

	High	Good	Moderate	Poor	Bad
-15 m	<1.42	1.42 to 2.07	2.07 to 2.57	2.57 to 3.65	>3.65

Mercury Concentration (mg per g DW), blade of adult leaves, between June and July

	High	Good	Moderate	Poor	Bad
-15 m	<0.0455	0.0455 to 0.0611	0.0611 to 0.0727	0.0727 to 0.1035	>0.1035

Plomb Concentration (mg per g DW), blade of adult leaves, between June and July

	High	Good	Moderate	Poor	Bad
-15 m	<1.03	1.03 to 1.54	1.54 to 2.19	2.19 to 4.84	>4.84



United Nations Environment Programme
Mediterranean Action Plan
Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (RAC/SPA)
Boulevard du leader Yasser Arafat - B.P. 337 - 1080 Tunis Cedex - TUNISIA
Tel.: (+216) 71 206 649 / 71 206 485 / 71 206 851 • Fax: (+216) 71 206 490
E-mail: car-asp@rac-spa.org • www.rac-spa.org